



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## THE PRIMITIVE TEUTONIC ORDER OF WORDS.

## I.

## INTRODUCTION.

IN striking contrast with our relatively precise knowledge of phonology is our ignorance of certain subjects in syntax, especially of the order of words. The phonology of primitive Teutonic we know with something like scientific accuracy; the order of words is still a matter of doubt and uncertainty. This uncertainty is strikingly illustrated by the number of different opinions that have been offered on the subject. For example, note the different theories as to the original position of the verb. Erdmann<sup>1</sup> and Tomanetz<sup>2</sup> maintain that in primitive Teutonic the normal position of the verb was second in the clause. A greater number, including Ries<sup>3</sup> and Behaghel,<sup>4</sup> believe that the normal position of the verb was at the end of the clause. An opinion different from both of these is that recently advanced by Wackernagel,<sup>5</sup> who maintains that the differentiation of principal and subordinate clauses in modern German is no specific modern development, but is the direct lineal representative of the original Indo-European order of words. Braune<sup>6</sup> takes a still different view, and believes that the order of words in primitive Teutonic was free. Wunderlich,<sup>7</sup> practically in agreement with Braune, has recently expressed

<sup>1</sup> Erdmann, *Grundzüge der deutschen Syntax*, Stuttg., 1886.

<sup>2</sup> Tomanetz, *Relativsätze bei den ahd. Übersetzern des 8 u. 9 Jh.*, Wien, 1879.

<sup>3</sup> Ries, *Quellen und Forschungen*, XLI. 4.

<sup>4</sup> Behaghel, *Germania*, XXIII. 284.

<sup>5</sup> Wackernagel, *I. F.*, I. 333.

<sup>6</sup> Braune, *Forschungen zur deutschen Philologie. Festgabe zur R. Hildebrand*, Leipzig, 1894.

<sup>7</sup> Wunderlich, *Der deutsche Satzbau*, Stuttg., 1892.

the opinion that in primitive Teutonic the speech-element coming first in articulation was the one that stood in the foreground of consciousness at the moment of utterance. Such is the diversity of opinion on this subject.

A final solution of the problem can be had only after a thorough investigation of the order of words in the oldest dialects of the Teutonic group. This field of investigation has been by no means neglected. Ries induces his theory, already mentioned, from the facts of word-order observed in the *Heliand* and in *Beowulf*. Tomanetz's theory is based on facts observed in the OHG. translations of the eighth and ninth centuries. Other investigators have been at work: Lohner,<sup>1</sup> Starker,<sup>2</sup> Rannow,<sup>3</sup> Ohly,<sup>4</sup> Erdmann,<sup>5</sup> and Gering<sup>6</sup> in OHG.; Friedrichs<sup>7</sup> in Gothic; Kube,<sup>8</sup> Todt,<sup>9</sup> and Smith<sup>10</sup> in Old English. But heretofore, if we except the passing consideration given the subject by Hermann,<sup>11</sup> no one has attempted to collate the results of these separate investigations. It is my aim to take this further step, and from the results of the investigations mentioned above and of independent investigations of my own in Gothic, in Old Norse, and in Old English, to converge as many rays of light as possible on this obscure point and to determine whether the facts in the different dialects do not point to some one order of words in the primitive Teutonic speech.

But before proceeding to cite statistics and draw conclusions, I shall attempt to define my method by clearing up an ambiguity which has misled many writers on this subject. This ambiguity arises from the twofold meaning attached to

<sup>1</sup> Lohner, *Zt. f. d. Phil.* 14. 173 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Starker, *Wortstellung der Nachsätze in den ahd. Übersetzungen des Matthäus-Evangeliums, des Isidor und des Tatian*, Progr. Beuthen, 1883.

<sup>3</sup> Rannow, *Der Satzbau des ahd. Isidor*, Berlin, 1888.

<sup>4</sup> Ohly, *Wortstellung bei Otfrid*, Diss. Freiburg, 1888.

<sup>5</sup> Erdmann, *Syntax des Sprache Otfrids*, Halle, 1874-76.

<sup>6</sup> Gering, *Causalsätze bei den ahd. Übersetzern des 8 u. 9 Jh.*, Halle, 1876.

<sup>7</sup> Friedrichs, *Stellung des pron. pers. im Gotischen*, Diss. Jena, 1891.

<sup>8</sup> Kube, *Wortstellung in der Sachsenchronik*, Diss. Jena, 1886.

<sup>9</sup> Todt, *Anglia*, 16.

<sup>10</sup> Smith, *Mod. Lang. Assoc. of Amer.*, 1893.

<sup>11</sup> Hermann, *K. Z.* 33.

the phrase *order of words*. Order of words may refer to a *subjective* movement, to the order in which the thought-elements receive expression. In this sense of the phrase, the order of words is, or tends to be, always the same, in all languages, ancient or modern; or perhaps better expressed, the principles that determine the order of words, in this sense of the phrase, are universal, as valid for synthetic Latin as for analytic French or English. This general subjective order in the progression of ideas is from the known to the unknown. Of a thing known, something new, unknown, is predicated. That the new idea may be connected with ideas already in mind, the speaker begins with something known. This something known, from which the speaker sets out, called by Weil<sup>1</sup> the "initial notion," by von der Gabelentz<sup>2</sup> the "psychological subject," naturally comes first, the "goal of discourse," or "psychological predicate," coming last. The goal of one proposition may form the initial notion of the proposition following, making a continuous thought-chain. Only in case of passion or excitement, when the new idea or feeling rushes with violence to the foreground of consciousness, does it come first in the proposition. This departure from the rule, known as 'pathetic order,' is often made by persons in speaking of subjects with which they are very familiar or by persons under the influence of passion, as in poetry. The speaker in such cases is apt to jump from one point to another without giving the connecting thought.

At the cost of a slight digression I shall attempt to expound some of the universal principles that determine word-order in this first acceptation of the phrase. In the first place, word-order is influenced by the nature of the clause. Imperative clauses are quite different in nature from affirmative clauses, and this difference has its influence directly on the accentuation, indirectly on the order of words. For instance, in imperative clauses the interest is centred in the verb, which, accordingly, should have the position of greatest emphasis.

<sup>1</sup> Weil, *Order of Words in the Ancient Languages*, transl. by Super, Boston, 1887.

<sup>2</sup> Von der Gabelentz, *Zt. f. Volkerpsych.*, VIII. 1874-75.

Further, clauses of command are usually isolated and are, therefore, free from the influence of context. Interrogative clauses differ from affirmative clauses in that a question has not in itself the completeness that belongs to a statement of fact, but waits for a reply. This peculiar incompleteness, expectancy, influences the accentuation and, directly or indirectly, the order of words. Wunderlich has pointed out the essential difference between principal and subordinate clauses. He says (p. 91): 'In the principal clause consciousness and language work almost simultaneously; in the subordinate clause consciousness precedes speech. The principal clause builds itself up before the hearer in individual elements; the subordinate clause, on the other hand, introduces complete ideas with which the principal clause deals as with a unity.' This difference between principal and subordinate clauses has its influence on the order of words. For the subordinate clause the most appropriate construction is the 'locked construction,' the governing word, usually the verb, standing at the end.

Such internal forces undoubtedly influence word-order. Another potent influence is the consideration of emphasis. This has usually been regarded as the most important influence in determining the order of words. It is usually assumed that the first place in the sentence is the position of emphasis.

This is possibly true of isolated sentences; but, as was explained in the introduction, in context, if there is any absolute position of emphasis in affirmative clauses, it is at the end of the clause.

To form a more accurate notion of the influence of emphasis in determining word-order, we must bear in mind that this influence is an indirect one. The desire to emphasize first influences the accentuation and only indirectly, through the accentuation, influences the order of words. The principle of emphasis, then, influences word-order only in this way, that a writer or speaker always endeavors to place the word to be emphasized in the position that naturally has the stress, the next most important word in the position that naturally has the secondary stress, and so on, thus placing the ideas in perspective.

To determine the principles of accentuation, then, is necessary before one can understand the influence of the principle of emphasis on word-order. This has not yet been satisfactorily done. In making such a determination, the unit of language considered must be, not the logical unit, the sentence, but the spoken unit, the breath group. At present we know only that the accentuation is different in different kinds of clauses, the interrogative clause differing in this respect from the affirmative clause, and that different languages have peculiar modes of accentuation. For example, in French the accent seems to fall naturally at the end of the breath group ; in Irish it seems to fall naturally at the beginning. Note the peculiar influence of the different national modes of accentuation on the word-order in the following sentences: 'At such a time as this I wouldn't tell you a lie.' 'It's not a lie that I'd be tellin' you now.'

All that we can say at present about the influence of emphasis on word-order, is that the emphasis of any position is not an absolute one, but a relative one, depending on the language, on the kind of clause, and on the number of unemphatic words surrounding the position.

The consideration of force has a great influence in determining the order of words ; but in word-order, as in the more general subject of rhetoric, the first essential is clearness. This influence, which heretofore has been almost entirely overlooked, is the most potent influence in determining word-order. Clearness is promoted by putting next to each other words which are connected in thought, and accordingly upon connection as well as upon emphasis depends the order of words. The element that stands at the beginning of a clause is not necessarily the element to be emphasized : it is usually the element that is associated, by likeness or contrast, with the last element in the preceding clause. The arrangement of words and phrases in a clause is determined primarily by the nearness of their relation to each other.

In addition to the above-mentioned principles determining word-order, must be mentioned the logical one, analogy. The tendencies which owe their origin to considerations of con-

nection or of emphasis have, by a levelling process, developed into fixed rules. The result is the fixed order characteristic of the modern analytic languages, in which different arrangements of words have different meanings.

It must further be noted that the order of words in poetry is quite different from that in prose. The functions of the two kinds of writing are in many respects different. Poetry expresses states of feeling that cannot easily be expressed in prose. It does this because it throws off the restraints of logical arrangement, and jumps from idea to idea more in the natural manner of thought. In the older Teutonic literature the usual arrangement of the essential elements of the clause is often departed from, the 'pathetic order' appearing in the form of inversion. In the later literature the same order occurs, but the real inversion is concealed through the use of a deputy subject (*e.g.*, *es war* . . . etc.).

The order of words representing the order of ideas, as we said above, is governed by the same general principles in all languages, ancient and modern. Note the difference of meaning in the two following different arrangements of the same sentence:<sup>1</sup> 'To escape from his misery, he slew himself; He slew himself to escape from his misery.' The choice between these two arrangements would be determined by the context. The principles of connection and emphasis would operate. The speaker would begin with the known, reserving the new element for the end. Note exactly the same effect of order in the two following Latin sentences: *Quia natura mutari non potest, idcirco verae amicitiae sempiternae sunt; Verae amicitiae sempiternae sunt, quia natura mutari non potest.* We have another illustration in the stock example, *Romulus Romam condidit*. The order of words in this proposition will depend on the context, on the thread of the discourse. If the subject under discussion is the founding of cities, the 'initial notion,' or 'psychological subject,' will be the founding, and the order will be: *Condidit Romam Romulus; the founder of Rome was Romulus*. If, on the other hand, the subject in hand is the founder, the order will be: *Idem Romulus Romam*

<sup>1</sup> This and the following two examples are quoted from Weil.

*condidit*; *The same Romulus founded Rome*. If the subject is the cities founded, the order will be: *Hanc urbem condidit Romulus*; *This city was founded by Romulus*. In each instance the principle of connection operates; the idea connecting with what precedes, comes first; the new idea comes last. In other words, the progression is from the known to the unknown. Or, expressed in still different terms, the 'psychological subject' comes first in each instance, the 'psychological predicate' last.

*Order of words* may, however, have a second, very different meaning. It may denote an *objective* movement. It may refer to the relative position of the essential terms of a proposition. As Bergaigne<sup>1</sup> has maintained, there are but two essential relations between the terms of a proposition, — the predicative and the dependent. Consequently there are but three essential terms, — the subject, the predicate, and the object. The history of the proposition with three essential terms is probably as follows: We express our thoughts by means of words grouped into sentences or propositions. Originally the groups most commonly occurring were those expressing action. For such expression, if complete, there are essential three fundamental terms: one to express the *actor*, another the *action*, a third *that acted upon*. Though not all groups had actions to express, propositions expressing action occurred so frequently as to become the dominating type, so much so that to this model were conformed the less frequent expressions not describing action, so that in the end all propositions, whether expressing action or not, became constituted with three essential terms called *subject*, *object*, *predicate*. Though in many instances the subject is no longer the actor, as in passive constructions, this pattern is the one used in all propositions. The question as to the order of these terms, it will be readily seen, is quite different from the question as to the order of words representing the order of ideas.

It is apparent that the order of words representing the order of ideas, since it is the same in all languages, ancient and modern, is not a subject for historical consideration.

<sup>1</sup> Bergaigne, *Mem. Soc. de Linguistique*, III.



The matter of the relative position of the syntactical terms—subject, predicate, object—is different. In uninflected languages the order of words is an important means of indicating syntactical relations. It shows not only the order in which the words presented themselves in the mind of the writer, but it serves to indicate the person or thing acting and the person or thing acted upon. Even in inflected languages there will gradually establish itself a traditional order of words. Ideas become associated with forms of expression, and in consequence the order of words becomes fixed. Speech custom is developed. For example, in Malay, Polynesian, Siamese, Anamese, the attribute follows, by preference, the word modified; in Teutonic, Chinese, Tartar, Japanese, it precedes. In modern English also, in principal clauses, idiom demands that the grammatical subject precede the grammatical predicate. Within these restraints the principles, above mentioned, of connection and emphasis must operate. When these principles demand that the person or thing acting stand at the end, there must be some way of evading the fixed law of order. This evasion is usually effected by the use of the passive, or by the use of a deputy subject. One instance must suffice. In the sentence, ‘There came about a revulsion of public sentiment,’ the principle of emphasis prescribes that *revulsion of sentiment* should come last. This desired order is obtained without violation of the fixed principle that the grammatical subject should come first, by the use of the deputy subject, *there*. Here, then, we see the psychological principle of emphasis operating within the restraints of a conventional order of grammatical terms, or *order of words* as we shall henceforth use the phrase.

By making this distinction between the two different meanings of the phrase, *order of words*, we have accomplished two results. In the first place, we have eliminated certain theories as to the primitive Teutonic order. When Wunderlich asserts that ‘the order of words is determined by the order in which the different thought elements present themselves in consciousness,’ he is probably right as far as he goes; but he leaves still undetermined the order of the syntactical parts

in a proposition. His theory, then, has no bearing on our discussion. Braune's<sup>1</sup> recent discussion of the subject is open to an objection of the same kind. In his paper he considers only the position of the verb, and considers practically only three possible positions. His discussion narrows itself to this: Did the verb occupy the first, the second, or the third position of stress in the clause? He concludes that the verb was free to occupy any one of these three positions. His conclusion is probably right. But was not this position subject to one of the general principles mentioned above? Did not this freedom of position exist, as in modern German and in modern English, within the restraints of a fixed order of syntactical terms? This is what I shall try to determine in the following pages.

The second result accomplished is the exact definition of our subject. I shall now proceed to discuss the relative position in primitive Teutonic of the grammatical terms, *subject*, *predicate*, *object*.

As already mentioned, many different theories have been advanced. Wunderlich's we may leave out of consideration after the discussion above. The theory that the order of words in Indo-European was free, if it refers to the order of syntactical parts, cannot have been true for any long period; for besides the natural association of ideas with forms of expression, it seems probable, from the evidence of compounds, that the IE. parent speech in its earliest stages was uninflected, and therefore dependent on word-order for the indication of the syntactical relations between the terms, *subject*, *object*, *predicate*.

One might infer on *a priori* grounds that in the case of a proposition with three simple terms, the natural order would be, *subject*, *object*, *predicate*. This is the order followed in the language of the deaf and dumb; but it is difficult in this matter entirely to eliminate the influence of custom and to say with certainty that the order *subject*, *object*, *verb* is, from intrinsic reasons, the natural one. We must, then, search for further evidence.

<sup>1</sup> Braune, *Forschungen zur deutschen Philologie*, "Festgabe für R. Hildebrand," Leipzig, 1894.

Some of this further evidence is supplied by compounds and by inflected forms of speech. From inflected verbal forms, in which the verbal root precedes the pronominal element of the ending, and from compounds in which qualifier precedes qualified, we infer that in the primitive form of the IE. language the predicate preceded the subject. From compounds in which governed precedes governing, we infer that in primitive IE. the object preceded the predicate. The primitive norm of order, then, would be, *object, predicate, subject*.

Further evidence on this subject is supplied by the earliest monuments of the different languages of the IE. family. This evidence seems to point to the fact that in the parent language the predicate came last in the proposition. In Greek, in Russ., in Armen., and in Celtic, traces of this original order are relatively few. Also in early Teutonic it remains to demonstrate conclusively that this was the original order. But in Lith. and in Lat. the tendency is most noticeable. In Cæsar's Commentaries on the Gallic war, 2d book, if we leave the verb *be* out of consideration, there are only fifteen instances in which the verb stands elsewhere than at the end of the clause. Further, in O.Pers. and in Skt. the verb at the end is the regular order. In the Brahmanas, even in the locative absolute, the most primitive form of the proposition, the verb stands last, though in this same text the qualifiers regularly precede the qualified. It is to be noted that the relation between an adjective and its substantive is the same as that between subject and predicate; the adjective and its substantive is equivalent to a subordinate clause. To adopt Bergaigne's conclusions, the order of subject and predicate seems to have been inverted in principal propositions in order to distinguish these from subordinate ones, the original order being represented by the position of the attributive adjective before its substantive. The relative position of subject and object in Skt. prose and in oldest Lat. was evidently variable. But the tendency was to place the subject before the object, which in turn directly preceded the predicate. This was no doubt due to the logical

dualism of the proposition, according to which the subject formed one part, the predicate and object a second. Naturally, then, when the primitive order was inverted, the subject placed itself first, forming the first part of the proposition, while the predicate, preceded by the object, formed the second part. To the type of order, then, *object, subject, predicate*, may be added a second type, probably used concurrent with the first, and probably soon becoming dominant, *subject, object, predicate*.

Further strong evidence in favor of this position of the verb at the end is supplied by Delbrück.<sup>1</sup> He shows that the regular position of the verb in Skt. was at the end, and that the enclitic accentuation of the Skt. verb was probably due to this position. He further shows that the accent of the Greek verb is that of the Skt. verb, only modified by the law of three moræ. He concludes that this accent is proethnic, and that consequently the final position of the verb, the cause of the accent, is proethnic.

Evidence, both *a priori* and *a posteriori*, seems to indicate that originally in IE. the verb stood at the end of the clause. The question, then, arises, whether the order of words in Teutonic is descended directly from that of the parent speech or is a new development. The former supposition seems much the more probable, since the Teutonic could hardly have been entirely independent of the parent language in this matter. External evidence, then, would lead us to expect that in primitive Teutonic the regular position of the verb was last in the clause.

It remains to bring internal evidence to bear on the solution of this problem.

## II.

### WORD-ORDER IN GOTHIC.

In making an historical study of Teutonic word-order, we naturally direct our attention first to the oldest language in

<sup>1</sup> Delbrück, *Syntaktische Forschungen*, IV. p. 148 ff.

the family, to the Gothic. Unfortunately there are preserved in Gothic only two works of sufficient length to be of any value in the study of word-order; the translation of the Bible by Wulfila, and the so-called Skeireins, fragments of a commentary on the Gospel of John.

For the study of word-order, Wulfila is of little value, owing to the slavish way in which he followed the Greek order. Friedrichs, in his investigation of the word-order in Wulfila, explains the exact correspondence of the Gothic order with that of the Greek original, as resulting not from slavish imitation on the part of the translator, but from the natural similarity of word-order in the two languages. But so exact a coincidence in every phrase is hardly to be explained in this simple manner. Although many of the Greek idioms belong also to Teutonic, and actually do occur in other ancient Teutonic monuments, it is absurd to assume between any two languages a natural similarity in word-order as striking as that between the Gothic translation of the Bible and the Greek original. Consequently the statistics gathered by Friedrichs show not the word-order of the Gothic of that period, but that of New Testament Greek, and the only evidence afforded by the translation of Wulfila is that offered by those passages 1) in which the Gothic employs more words than the Greek does and, therefore, necessarily has an independent arrangement, or 2) in which the word-order of the translation differs from that of the original.

Such passages are not numerous. In the fragmentary translation of Matthew, if we leave out of consideration differences in the position of the particles, we find less than a hundred. Of these passages three-fourths are 1) instances of Gothic circumlocution, and only about one-fourth are 2) instances of departure from the Greek order.

The few general tendencies revealed in these passages I will point out.

(a) The position of the Gothic particle usually corresponds to that of the Greek particle, *e.g.* :

*þugkeiþ im auk* = *δοκοῦσιν γάρ*, vi. 7.

But frequently the Greek post-positive particle is represented in Gothic by a particle standing first in the clause, *e.g.* :

*Ip huzdjaiþ izwis* = Θησαυρίζετε δὲ ὑμῖν, vi. 20 ;  
*unte jabai fjaiþ ainana* = ἡ γὰρ τὸν ἕνα μισήσαι, vi. 24.

(*b*) The object pronoun follows the verb.

1) Independent of the Greek, *e.g.* :

*þugkeiþ im auk* = δοκοῦσιν γὰρ, vi. 7 ;  
*ogeip izwis ins* = φοβηθήτε αὐτοὺς, x. 26 ;  
*ataugidedun sik* = ἐνεφανίσθησαν, xxvii. 53.

2) In disagreement with Greek order, *e.g.* :

*ibai hvan atgibai þuk* = μήποτε σε παραδῶ, iii. 25 ;  
*Mipþanei is rodida þata du im* = ταῦτα αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος αὐτοῖς, ix. 18.

NOTE. — There is one exception, due no doubt to counter-tendency (*f*).  
*ik in watin izwis dauþja* = Ἐγὼ μὲν βαπτίζω ὑμᾶς ἐν ὕδατι, iii. 11.

(*c*) The possessive adjective (pronominal) follows its substantive.

1) Independent of the Greek, *e.g.* :

*þo giba þeina* = τὸ δῶρον, iii. 24.

2) In disagreement with the Greek, *e.g.* :

*haubiþ þein* = σου τὴν κεφαλὴν, vi. 17 ;  
*waurda meina* = μου τοὺς λόγους, vii. 26.

(*d*) On the other hand the demonstrative adjective precedes its substantive.

1) Independent of the Greek. No instances.

2) In disagreement with the Greek, *e.g.* :

*in jainai weilai* = ἐν τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐκείνῃ, viii. 13.

NOTE. — In one instance a numeral follows its noun in disagreement with the Greek order. *bi weila niundon* = περὶ δὲ τὴν ἐνάτην ὥραν, xxvii. 46.

(*e*) The dependent genitive precedes its substantive.

1) Independent of the Greek. One instance,

*in Tyre jah Seidone londa* = ἐν Τύρῳ καὶ Σειδῶνι, xi. 26.

2) In disagreement with Greek order. One instance,

*afstassais bokos* = ἀποστάσιον, iii. 31.

(f) There is a tendency in the case of verbs to place the governed before the governing word.

1) Independent of the Greek. The past participle always precedes the finite verb, *e.g.* :

*gameliþ ist* = ἡγεγράφται, xi. 10 ;

*wrohiþs ist* = κατηγορεῖσθαι, xxvii. 12 ;

*þatei du stauai gatauhans warþ* = ὅτι κατεκρίθη, xxvii. 3.

In a similar manner predicate nouns precede their verb, *e.g.* :

*ni skuld ist* = οὐκ ἔξεστιν, xxvii. 6 ;

*uskunþ was* = ἐφάνη, ix. 33 ;

*hrain warþ* = ἐκαθάρσθητι, viii. 3.

NOTE. — This does not hold true of imperative clauses, *e.g.*, *wairþ hrains* = καθάρισθητι, viii. 3.

The verb may stand at the end of the clause.

1) Independent of the Greek, *e.g.* :

*sumaiþ þan lofam slohun* = οἱ δὲ ἐρράπισαν, xxvi. 67.

2) In disagreement with Greek order.

*ik in watin izwis dauþja* = Ἐγὼ μὲν βαπτίζω ὑμᾶς ἐν ὕδατι, iii. 11.

The favorite position of the object pronoun, then, seems to be after the verb. It must be noted, however, that the pronouns occurring are mostly reflexives, and further that in none of the instances cited above does the pronoun have a direct reference to the preceding clause. Consequently in none of these instances was there any special motive for giving the pronoun a position early in the clause, and the instances may not represent the general tendency.

The possessive adjectives follow the substantive, and since they are all pronominal, perhaps there is some connection between this position and that of the object pronoun. The fact that the Greek post-positive particle is frequently represented in Gothic by a particle at the beginning of the clause

indicates that the initial place in the Gothic clause is not as much as in Greek a place of emphasis.

But the most noticeable fact is the evident fondness for the synthetic order (governed preceding governing word). This construction is favored in the position of the demonstrative adjective before its substantive, in the position of the dependent genitive before its governing noun, and in the position of the finite verb in relation to objects, to participles, and to predicate nouns.

The evidence, then, afforded by Wulfila is not comprehensive enough. The value of the Skeireins for determining the word-order is diminished by the consideration that this work also may be a translation.

That it is not a translation, at least not a slavish translation, from the Greek seems probable from the order of words. One feature of the Skeireins is the citation of biblical passages upon which the comments are made. These<sup>1</sup> passages are probably taken from Wulfila, and the word-order is, of course, that of Wulfila. The statistics for the word-order in these passages cited agrees essentially with those gathered by Friedrichs from Wulfila direct, if we make allowance for the fact that Friedrichs considers only clauses with pronominal subject. Friedrichs's statistics are as follows:

	NORMAL.	PART. TRANSP.	TRANSP.
Principal Clauses	115	25	55
Subordinate Clauses	60	15	30

The statistics that I have gathered for the citations in the Skeireins are:

	NORMAL.	PART. TRANSP.	TRANSP.
Principal	19	3	10
Subordinate	24	0	5

Each of these sets of statistics represents Greek order. Note now the difference in the statistics for the independent part of the Skeireins:

	NORMAL.	PART. TRANSP.	TRANSP.
Principal	12	11	39
Subordinate	16	16	23

<sup>1</sup> Marold, *Die Schriftcitete der Skeireins*, Progr. Königsberg, 1892.



The order of words, then, in the Skeireins proper, effectually dispels any idea that the Skeireins is a slavish translation, from the Greek at least.

That the Skeireins is not a translation from the Latin is by no means certain. In certain peculiar features the word-order resembles that of Latin. For instance note the frequent separation of adjective and substantive by verb, *e.g.* :  
*þo ahmeinon anafilhands daupeins*, III. b ; *þana laist skeiris brukjands waurdis*, V. b ; *þosei ustauhana habaida wairþan fram frauþin garehsn*, I. b.

But in other respects the work shows idioms which seem to be peculiar to itself. For a list, *vid.* Bernhardt, *Wulfila*, p. 612. On the whole, in default of any further evidence to the contrary, we will assume that word-order in the Skeireins proper represents the Gothic word-order of that time (probably the fifth century).

#### A. PRINCIPAL CLAUSES.

##### I. Affirmative Clauses.

###### 1. *Relative Position of Subject and Finite Verb.*

It is a difficult matter to determine with any degree of accuracy the frequency of inversion or the laws governing its occurrence, owing to the fact that in 47 instances out of 76, the total number of principal affirmative clauses, the grammatical subject is unexpressed. The favored order, however, seems to be the 'direct.' In the 29 clauses with grammatical subject expressed, the order is 'direct' in 20, *e.g.* :

*þatuh wesi wipra þata gadob*, I. c ; *þo nu insakana wesun fram Iohanne*, IV. d.

Furthermore, in many of the clauses with long transposition, the order could hardly have been inverted if the subject had been expressed, *e.g.* :

*at allamma waurstwe ainaizos anabusnais beidiþ*, V. a ; *jah swa managai ganohjands . . . ni þatainei ganauhan þaurftais im fragaf, ak filaus maizo*, VII. b.

Even in clauses with introductory adverbial phrases, the order is not always inverted. Three instances of 'irregular-direct'<sup>1</sup> order occur:

*Inuh pis . . . nasjands . . . anastodjands, ustaiknada pana . . .*, II. a ;  
*batuh pan qipands aiwaggelista ataugida ei . . .*, III. a ; *pata nu*  
*gasaihvands, Johannes posei . . .*, *mip sunjai qap*, I. b.

In this same category are to be placed other clauses with introductory phrases, in which the subject is not expressed but in which the order corresponds to the 'direct' order, *e.g.*:

*inuh pis nu jah leik mans andnam*, I. d ;  
*inuh pis bairhtaba uns laiseip qipands*, III. d.

Usually, however, in clauses with introductory phrases, when the subject is expressed, the order is inverted; when the subject is not expressed, the verb stands next to the introductory phrase, as it would stand in an inverted clause, *e.g.*:

*inuh pis qam gamains allaize nasjands*, I. a ; *swaei sijai daupeins*  
*Johannes*, III. d ; *gadob nu was mais pans . . .*, I. c ; *batuh pan*  
*insok kunnands*, V. a.

In all, there occur 9 instances of inversion, some in clauses with introductory phrases, like those quoted above, others with the verb at the beginning of the clause. Two instances of the latter occur:

*skulum nu allai weis*, V. c ;  
*wasuh pan jah frauja . . .*, III. b.

There are not enough instances of clauses in the apodosis, to enable one to determine what is the regular order in such clauses. There is one instance of inversion:

*bigitan was pize hlaibe ib. tainjons fullos*, VII. c.

We conclude, then, that the usual order is the direct, but that the inverted order also occurs, especially after introductory phrases. The following table will show the frequency of the different arrangements:

SUBJECT NOT EXPRESSED.	DIRECT.		INVERTED.	
	With Introd.	Without Introd.	With Introd.	Without Introd.
47	3	17	7	2

<sup>1</sup> Direct order after an introd. word or phrase other than subject or verb.

2. *Position of Verb with Relation to Dependencies.*

There is a marked tendency to place the verb, if not last in the clause, at least after one or more of the adverbial dependencies. An instance of partial transposition is:

*jah swa managai ganohjands . . . ni patainei ganauhan paurftais im fragaf, ak filaus maizo, VII. b.*

An instance of especially long transposition is:

*unte pata qipano ei . . . , ni ibnon ak galeika sweripa usgiban uns laiseip, V. d.*

But though the tendency is to place the verb after other members of the clause, there is everywhere evident a great freedom of arrangement. This freedom was noticed in the position of the verb with relation to the subject; it is also manifest in the verb's position with relation to its dependencies. For instance, in the same page, in Balg's edition, in expressing similar ideas the writer employs different arrangements of words, *e.g.*:

*inuh pis bairhtaba uns laiseip qipands, III. d;*

*inuh pis laiseip uns qipands, IV. a.*

Words to be emphasized are free to stand first in the clause, *e.g.*:

*mahtedi sweþauh jah im . . . I. b;*

*gadob nu was mais þans . . . I. c;*

*naudipaurfts auk was jah gadob wistai, II. d.*

The following table will show the relative frequency of the different positions of the verb with relation to its dependencies:

NEUTRAL.	NORMAL.	PART. TRANSP.	TRANSP.
5	12	11	39

II. *Imperative and Interrogative Clauses.*

There are no instances of independent imperative clauses, and only two of direct questions. In one of these latter the

verb stands first, although with no subject expressed. In the other the transposed order occurs :

*nei auk puhtedi pau in garaihteins gaagwein ufargaggan po faura ju us anastodeinai garaidon garehsn*, I. c ; *hawiwa stojan jah ni stojan sa sama mahtedi*, V. b.

## B. SUBORDINATE CLAUSES.

### I. Relative Position of Subject and Verb.

The regular order in subordinate clauses is the direct. Only four instances of inversion occur.

*Afar patei matida so managei*, VII. c (Temporal) ;  
*in bizei ju jah leikis hraineino inmaidips was sidus jah . . .* III. b  
 (Causal) ;  
*hardizo bize ungalaubjandane warp hairto*, VI. c (Causal) ;  
*swaei sijai daupeins Johannes*, III. d (Result).

### 2. Position of Verb with Relation to its Dependencies.

There is to be noted in subordinate clauses the same tendency as in principal clauses to place the verb after its dependencies.

For subordinate clauses the statistics are :

#### a. PURPOSE CLAUSES.

	NEUTRAL.	NORMAL.	PART. TRANSP.	TRANSP.
	I	6	5	7
<i>e.g.:</i>				
<i>jah ni missaqipaina</i> , V. a (Neutral).				
<i>ei galaisjaina sik bi pamma twa</i> , V. a (Normal) ;				
<i>ei, . . . pizos manasedais gawaurhtedi uslunein</i> , I. a (Part. Transp.) ;				
<i>ei fraujsin mikilein gakannidedi</i> , IV. d (Transp.).				

#### b. SUBSTANTIVE CLAUSES.

	NEUTRAL.	NORMAL.	PART. TRANSP.	TRANSP.
	0	3	5	7
<i>e.g.:</i>				
<i>patei is was sa sama</i> , VII. d (Normal) ;				
<i>ataugida ei so garehsns bi ina nehva andja was pairh Herodes birunain</i> , III. a (Part. Transp.) ;				
<i>patei swaleikamma waldufnja mahtais nauhs ustaiknida wesi</i> , I. b (Transp.).				

## c. INDIRECT QUESTIONS.

NEUTRAL.	NORMAL.	PART. TRANSP.	TRANSP.
O	I	O	O

*ni kunnandins hvapar skuldedi maiza*, III. a.

## d. CLAUSES OF MANNER.

NEUTRAL.	NORMAL.	PART. TRANSP.	TRANSP.
I	2	O	O

*e.g.:*

*swe silba is qibib*, VI. a (Neutral) ;

*analeiko swe Fillippus gasakada* . . ., VII. a (Normal).

## e. CAUSAL CLAUSES.

NEUTRAL.	NORMAL.	PART. TRANSP.	TRANSP.
O	I	3	2

*e.g.:*

*in bizei ni attauhun ina*, VIII. b (Normal) ;

*in pis ei mibban frumist hausida fram laisarja*, II. b (Part. Transp.) ;

*in bizei wistai manna was*, IV. c (Transp.).

## f. RESULT CLAUSES.

NEUTRAL.	NORMAL.	PART. TRANSP.	TRANSP.
O	O	I	2

*e.g.:*

*eipan garaihtein warb bi swiknein sokeins gawagida*, III. b (Part. Transp.) ;

*eipan waila ins maudeib*, VI. a (Transp.).

## g. RELATIVE CLAUSES.

NEUTRAL.	NORMAL.	PART. TRANSP.	TRANSP.
2	3	I	3

*e.g.:*

*patei aflifnoda*, VII. c (Neutral) ;

*swe willda andniman ize*, VII. c (Normal) ;

*saei in aupida ·m· jere attans ize fodida*, VII. d (Transp.).

## h. CONCESSIVE CLAUSES.

NEUTRAL.	NORMAL.	PART. TRANSP.	TRANSP.
O	O	O	I

*bauhjabai us himina ana airpai in manne garehsnais qam*, IV. d.

## i. CONDITIONAL CLAUSES.

NEUTRAL.	NORMAL.	PART. TRANSP.	TRANSP.
O	O	I	I

*ip nu ains jah sama wesi bi Sabaillaus insahtai*, V. b (Part. Transp.) ;  
*jabai in leikai wisdn puhta*, IV. c (Transp.).

## j. TEMPORAL CLAUSES.

Only one temporal clause occurs; that one is inverted.

*afar patei matida so managei*, VII. c.

Summing up, we have for subordinate clauses the following statistics:

NEUTRAL.	NORMAL.	PART. TRANSP.	TRANSP.
4	16	16	23

It will be noted that the order, as in Wulfla, is substantially the same in principal and in subordinate clauses. In both kinds of clauses the favorite order is the transposed. A particularly striking instance of transposition is the following:

*ei, swesamma wiljin jah swesai mahtai galeikonds pamma faurþis  
gagiujandin dauþans, (silba, gagiujan dauþans) gahaitands þize  
ungalaubjandane þrasabalþein andbeitands gasoki*, V. b.

## C. PARTICIPIAL AND INFINITIVE PHRASES.

In participial and infinitive phrases there is manifest the same tendency as in principal and subordinate clauses, to place the verbal form at the end, or at least after one or more of the other members of the clause. Classifying these phrases according to the position of the verbal element, we obtain for the Skeireins proper the following statistics:

1. *Participles stand.*

NEUTRAL.	FIRST.	MIDDLE.	LAST.
12	27	15	44

2. *Infinitives stand.*

NEUTRAL.	FIRST.	MIDDLE.	LAST.
6	8	4	15

Under 'First' are included those clauses in which the participle (or infinitive) precedes all its dependencies, *e.g.*:

*gasaljands sik faur uns hunsl jas sauþ guþa*, I. a.  
*du afargaggan anabusn guþs*, I. c.

Under 'Middle' are included those clauses in which the verbal element follows some of its grammatical dependencies, but precedes others, *e.g.*:

*anduh þana laist skeiris brukjands waurdis*, V. b ;  
*skulum . . . weis . . . andsatjan bauranana*, V. c.

Under 'Last' are included those phrases in which the verbal element stands at the end, after all its dependencies, *e.g.*:

*ni ibna nih galeiks unsarai garaihtein ak silba garaihtei wisands*,  
 I. a ;  
*nu du leitilai hveilai galaubjan*, VI. a.

Under 'Neutral' are included those phrases consisting of verbal element (participle or infinitive) alone, *e.g.*:

*ei frauja gimands mahtai*, I. c ;  
*þana anawairþan dom*, II. c.

For the sake of convenience the present and past participles have been considered together. But among the instances considered, the present participle occurs most frequently (ninety-three out of ninety-eight). In fact, the frequent use of the present participle, which is used but sparingly in the other dialects, is a very noticeable feature of the Skeireins. A still more remarkable feature is the use of the present participle for the present indicative, *e.g.*:

*afaruh þan þo in wato wairþandans hrain jah hyssopon jah wullai  
 raudai ufartrausnjandans*, III. c.

The past participles that occur are usually combined with auxiliaries to make compound verbs. In Wulfila it was noted that in compound verbs the participle preceded the finite verb. The same is true in the Skeireins. In the Skeireins proper, among eleven compound verbs there is but one instance in which the participle follows the auxiliary, and in that instance the reason is self-evident.

*eipan garaihtaba warþ bi swiknein sokeins garwagida*, II. b.

In the same way a predicate noun or adjective precedes the copula, *e.g.* :

*silba garaihtei wisands*, I. a ;  
*in þizei wistai manna was*, IV. c ;  
*ains jah sa sama wesi*, V. b ;  
*guþ wisandin*, V. d.

Exceptions occur, but only three out of twenty, *e.g.* :

*at ni wisandein aljai waihtai*, VII. b.

The personal pronoun object in the Skeireins is an unstressed word, and like the particles, is free in its position, with the exception that it usually stands next to the verb. That is to say, it may follow or precede the verb. It was noted that in Wulfila the object pronoun preferred the position after the verb. This preference may be discerned also in the Skeireins. But usually the position of the pronoun object is determined by the context ; it is used, like the Greek particle, to separate two successive words which are to be emphasized, *e.g.* :

*ei laisareis uns wairþai þizos . . .*, I. d ;  
*inuh þis bairhtaba uns laiseiþ qipands . . .*, III. d ;  
*eipan waila ins maudeiþ qipands*, VI. a.

When the clause is transposed, the unstressed pronoun never follows, but precedes, thus adding to the emphasis of the verb in the final position, *e.g.* :

*unte þata qipano . . . uns laiseiþ*, V. d ;  
*ganohjands ins wailawiznai . . . im fragaf*, VII. b ;  
*swa filu auk gamanwida ins wairþan*, VII. c.



Reflexives, also, are usually unstressed, and are put immediately after the verb, *e.g.* :

*gasaljands sik*, I. a ; *afwandida sik*, II. a.

Only in case of inversion or of transposition, when the position after the verb is one of too great emphasis, does the reflexive precede the verb, *e.g.* :

*mib sis misso sik andrunnun sumai*, III. a.

*faur mel sik gahaban*, VIII. a.

First place in the sentence does not seem to have been a position of as great emphasis in Gothic as in Greek. In fact, the author of the Skeireins frequently places an unstressed particle in this position. With the Gothic the final position seems to have been the position of emphasis. In fact, the most noticeable feature of word-order in the Skeireins is the tendency to place the governing word after the word or words governed, 'Ascending Construction' or synthetic order. This construction is illustrated by the following striking examples :

*pizos du gupa garaihteins*, I. d ;

*pana iupa briggandin in piudangardjai gups wig*, II. a.

*þo leikeinon us wambai munands gabaurþ*, II. b ;

*leikis hraineino inmaidips was sidus jah so bi gup hrainei*, III. b.

*þosei ustauhana habaida wairþan fram frauþin garehsn*, I. b ;

*þo faura ju us anastodeinai garaidon garehsn*, I. c.

Instances of the opposite or 'Descending Construction' also occur, *e.g.* :

*afleta frawaurhte jah fragift weihis ahmins*, III. c.

Another striking feature is the rhetorical separation of words, *e.g.* :

*ak himinakunda anafilhands fulhsnja*, IV. d ;

*missaleikaim bandwiþs namnam*, V. b ;

*anduh þana laist skeiris brukjands waurdis*, V. a.

On the whole we must conclude that the Gothic order of words was by no means rigidly fixed. This fact is proved

for the Skeireins by the number of exceptions to any law that we may formulate, and by the rhetorical arrangements for emphasis; for the Bible translation by the license which permitted Wulfila to follow the Greek order so exactly, and yet to produce a work which is not only intelligible, but seemingly not unnatural. On the other hand, in both works there is manifest a fondness for the synthetic order. The governing word, noun or verb, usually comes after the governed word, thus binding the parts of the expression into a closely united whole.

### III.

#### OLD HIGH GERMAN WORD-ORDER.

The subject of word-order has been examined more carefully in OHG. than in any of the other Teutonic dialects. I shall content myself, therefore, with the results of the investigations of others, and shall only attempt to bring these results into a form convenient for reference and for comparison with the results of my own investigation in Gothic and in Old English. I shall take up the prose monuments in their chronological order, considering: first, the translations of the eighth and ninth centuries, including the Monsee-Wiener fragments of a translation of Matthew, the translation of Isidor's 'Contra Judæos' and that of Tatian's Gospel Harmony; second, Notker's translation of Boethius; third, Middle High German prose. Otfrid, since his work cannot illustrate the development of prose order, will be considered separately.

#### A. OHG. TRANSLATORS OF THE EIGHTH AND NINTH CENTURIES.

##### I. Principal Clauses.

Rannow, in his work on Isidor, says: "Was also erstens die Hauptsätze angeht, so sucht er [Isidor] den in der Ent-

wicklung des Deutschen immer mehr zur Geltung gelangenden Grundsatz zu befolgen, das finite Verb möglichst voran zu stellen." In the use of this order Isidor follows the Latin order in 71 instances, departs from the Latin order in 43 instances. Opposed to these are only 28 instances in which the translator, 23 times in agreement with the Latin, 5 times in disagreement, puts the verb at the end.

Tomanetz, who has examined the order in all three of the principal translations of the eighth and ninth centuries, reaches substantially the same conclusion. He asserts: "Für die ahd. selbständigen Hauptsätze, lässt sich wol als allgemeine Regel hinstellen, dass das Prädicat von dem betonten Wort angezogen wird, also zweite Stelle einnimmt, ausser es ist selbst betont, in welchen Fall es den Satz eröffnet." The following table<sup>1</sup> will show the relative frequency of the different arrangements, *s.v. . . .* and *s. . . . v.*

s.v. noun.	In disagreement with Latin	116	Independent of Latin	3
s.v. pron.	"	61	"	232
s.v. adv.	"	30	"	50
Total (s.v. . . .)		207	+	285=492

On the other hand:

s. noun v.	In disagreement with Latin	3	Independent of Latin	1
s. pron. v.	"	6	"	23
s. part. adv. v.	"	2	"	9
Total (s. . . . v.)		11	+	33=44

Further evidence to the same effect is supplied by clauses consisting of predicate word and copula. The order is:

<i>copula, pred. word.</i>	In disagreement with Latin	68 times.
<i>pred. word, copula.</i>	Independent of Latin	6 times.
<i>pred. word, copula.</i>	In disagreement with Latin	0 times.

The order of words, then, in principal clauses, when independent of the Latin, and even when in disagreement with the Latin, is most frequently the same as in modern High German principal clauses.

<sup>1</sup> This table is borrowed from Hermann. K.Z., 33.

## II. Subordinate Clauses.

In Isidor Rannow notes the tendency of the finite verb in subordinate clauses, more and more to seek the end position. This it does,

In agreement with the Latin original    41 times  
In disagreement with the Latin original   34 times

This phenomenon is made more striking by the small number of instances in which the finite verb was moved to the initial position.

In agreement with the Latin original    6 times  
In disagreement with the Latin original   8 times

Counter to this tendency to place the verb last, Rannow notices a tendency to put last the word or phrase to be emphasized. For example, the translator reserves the last place for prepositional phrases:

In agreement with the Latin original    70 times  
In disagreement with the Latin original   32 times

This counter-tendency in part explains the number of clauses not completely transposed.

In the relative clauses of the three works under consideration, Tomanetz has made the following observations:

The order of words is,

	LIKE THE LATIN.	WITHOUT LATIN ORIGINAL.	IN DISAGREEMENT WITH THE LATIN.	IN SPITE OF OTHER CHANGE FROM LATIN ORDER.
s.v. . . .	251	59	21	21
s. . . . v.	430	438	235	165
Total s.v. . . .	352.			Total s. . . . v. 1268.

Tomanetz further shows by statistics that among the words preceding the verb, the number of pronouns is relatively greater than of any other kind of word. He infers that from the order *s.v.* . . . which, he believes, was original, the distinctive order of the subordinate clause has been developed through the influence of subordinate clauses with pronominal

objects. Further, from the fact that the order, *s. . . v.*, is much less frequent in the second of two co-ordinate relative clauses, than in the first, in which this order is needed as a mark of distinction from principal clauses, he infers that the transposed order had its ultimate origin in the desire to differentiate subordinate from principal clauses.

We have no general statistics for inversion in these monuments of OHG. We have, however, the assertion of Gering regarding causal adverbs in the apodosis: "Von diesen Wörtern müssen diejenigen, welche am Satzanfange stehen, nach den Gesetzen der Germanischen Wortstellung, Inversion bewirken, d. h. das Prädicatsverbum unmittelbar an sich heranziehen." Starker makes the same assumption and upon it bases his explanation of the origin of inversion in the apodosis.

The other features of word-order in these works, it is hard to describe. Rannow has noted in Isidor the position of the genitive before its governing substantive. The genitive precedes in all instances except in that of two nouns both of which have the article. The arrangement occurs so often as to be characteristic of this work. It is further to be noted that in the translation of Tatian, which usually follows the original very closely, the adjectives and possessive genitives precede their substantives, even when in disagreement with the order in the original.

*B. NOTKER'S BOETHIUS* [end of 10th, begin. of 11th cent.].

Lohner believes that in Notker we have the pure expression of German speech feeling, and that from this work we may derive the laws of German Syntax. He bases this belief on the fact that the German of the translation in the main is like the Latin original only where the syntax in the two languages is the same, and especially on the fact that parenthetical expressions, independent of the Latin, agree in syntax with the translated parts, thus proving the independence of the latter. This freedom, as compared with the slavishness of the earlier translations, seems to show that the form of the High German language had at length become fixed,

and that the translator in consequence was not at liberty to follow his original slavishly.

The results of Lohner's investigations in Notker are as follows :

1. Relative and *conjunctional* clauses have the same construction as regards the order of words.

2. This work has a developed order of words in the dependent clauses, which expresses itself especially by the separation of the finite verb from the introductory word and by the final position of the verb wherever possible. The verb occupies the final position in about two-thirds of all *conjunctional*, and in about three-fourths of all relative clauses.

3. Where the verb has a medial position, and therefore other elements stand at the end, there may be perceived some special motive, rhetorical or euphonic, which occasions the older order.

4. From this freedom to stand at the end are excluded all simple pronouns and most pronominal phrases, also other words and phrases with weak stress, such as adverbs. In relative clauses, the frequency with which the various elements follow the verb is shown by the following statistics. There follow the verb :

1) Of prepositional phrases	30 %
2) Of the different noun objects	23 %
3) Of infinitives	20 %
4) Of <i>predicative</i> nouns	12 %
5) Of <i>nominale predicate</i> (incl. past part.)	9 %
6) Of noun subjects	2 %

5. Pronouns and particles usually take second or third place.

6. Even in the other classes of words there is recognizable a regular grammatical arrangement, which, however, may be specially modified for the emphasis of an element or in the interest of a smoother, more rhythmical flow.

In the period, then, between Notker and the earlier translators, a great development has taken place in the direction of uniformity in language. Traces, however, of the older

order of words appear here and there. In the apodosis, the modern German rule that the verb shall stand first is not regarded; and the earlier freedom to place the verb last, even in principal clauses, appears here and there.

### C. MIDDLE HIGH GERMAN.

In the Middle High German period the norms of word-order which we note in their incipency in the translators of the eighth and ninth centuries, and in their middle stage in Notker, have become fixed, so that the order of words in the prose of the period is essentially that of modern German prose. Only in poetry do we see traces of the original freer arrangement. This freedom manifests itself in various ways.

1. Transposition may occur in principal clauses.<sup>1</sup>
2. The direct order may occur after an introductory adverbial phrase.
3. Transposition may occur after an introductory adverbial phrase.
4. Several adverbial modifiers may stand first.
5. The attributive adjective may follow the noun.
6. The genitive may stand between the article and the substantive.
7. The substantive may be followed by the article with the dependent genitive.
8. The dependencies of an infinitive do not precede as often as in modern German. This holds true even of the Middle High German prose.

### D. OTFRID.

In poetry grammatical rules are not so rigidly observed as in prose, and in consequence poetry is not as valuable as prose in the historic study of word-order. For this reason, in the sequence followed thus far, all poetry has been unregarded. On the other hand, in poetry the expression,

<sup>1</sup> Paul, *Mhd. Grammatik*.

less hampered by grammatical restraints, is more natural, and, therefore, perhaps reflects the speech feeling better than prose does.

Otfrid's *Evangelienbuch*, written about 800 A.D., is one of the most considerable monuments of OHG. literature. The word-order in this poem has been investigated by Ohly; from the mass of statistics that he presents I have selected the following:

### I. Independent Affirmative Clauses.

#### 1. *Relative Position of Subject and Finite Verb.*

Side by side seem to stand two normal arrangements of words, the direct and the indirect. Leaving the apodosis out of consideration, the order is as follows:

	WITHOUT INTRODUCTORY WORD.	WITH INTRODUCTORY WORD.
Direct	1342 (neg. 86)	161
Indirect	714 (neg. 222)	1295

In the apodosis the direct order is the more frequent, though the indirect order occurs very frequently, both with and without introductory word or phrase.

#### 2. *Position of Verb in Relation to its Dependencies.*

In clauses with *direct* order the statistics are as follows:

	NORMAL.	PART. TRANSP.	TRANSP.
1) Without introductory word	1051 (neg. 39)	60	221 (neg. 40)
2) With introductory word	9	8	62
3) In apodosis	11	0	34
4) Introd. by particles, <i>ioh</i> , etc.	17	3	18
Total,	1088	71	335

In *inverted* clauses the order is as follows:

TOTAL.	V. AND S. TOGETHER.	V. AND S. SEPARATED.
495	348	147
The predicate noun follows the copula		320: 8
The infinitive follows the auxiliary		86: 7
The infinitive follows the dependencies		39: 49



## II. Subordinate Clauses.

### 1. *Relative Position of Subject and Finite Verb.*

All instances of inversion are to be regarded as exceptions to the rule, and due to metre.

DIRECT.	INDIRECT.
2539	100 (approx.)

### 2. *Position of Verb with Relation to its Dependencies.*

The total number of subordinate clauses containing elements besides subject and verb is 2539.

NORMAL AND PART. TRANSP.	TRANSP.
774	1765

The subject is preceded by some other member of the clause in 127 of the above instances.

## III. Clauses of Command.

When the subjunctive is used, the rules of word-order are the same as for affirmative clauses.

	DIRECT.	INDIRECT.
1) With introductory word	9	69
2) Without introductory word	4	31

When the imperative is used, the subject is usually left unexpressed (579 instances). When the subject is expressed the order is,

	DIRECT.	INDIRECT.
1) With introductory word	0	32
2) Without introductory word	5	11

## IV. Independent Questions.

In interrogative clauses *a*) without interrogative word and *b*) with interrogative word serving as object, the order is, nearly without exception, inverted. When *c*) the interrogative pronoun is subject of the clause, the order is direct. The instances occurring are *a*) 27, *b*) 45, *c*) 29.

### V. General Remarks.

1. The attributive adjective may be placed after its substantive. When two adjectives qualify the same noun, three different arrangements are possible: 1) both before, 2) both after, 3) one after, the other before.

2. The genitive, if it has no article, may be placed between the article or adjective and the substantive.

3. The dependencies of the infinitive are not placed before as regularly as in modern German.

From the above statistics we see that the difference between principal and subordinate clauses was much more marked in Otfrid than in the prose translations of the eighth and ninth centuries. In Otfrid the modern German rule of order is observed in four-fifths of all instances in both kinds of clause, principal and subordinate. Another noticeable feature is the frequent use of inversion. This, as Ohly shows, cannot be attributed wholly to the demands of metre, but must, in many instances, be explained as 'pathetic order.'

### E. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS.

From the evidence of the statistics quoted from the different OHG. monuments, we must infer that at the time when the earliest works that have descended to us, were composed, there already existed a feeling for the difference between principal and subordinate clauses, which expressed itself by a difference in word-order. In this belief we are confirmed after a hasty consideration of the *Hildebrandslied*. In this, the oldest monument of OHG. literature, the regular order in subordinate clauses is the transposed. The statistics, hastily gathered, are as follows:

	INVERTED.		DIRECT.	
	Verb First.	Verb not First.	Normal.	Transp.
Principal clauses	3	12	18 <sup>1</sup>	2
Subordinate clauses	0	2	1	24 <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Six consisting of subject and verb alone.

<sup>2</sup> In one instance the verb has the medial position (Part. Transp.).

The infinitive, used in connection with a finite verb, follows its dependencies in ten instances, preceding only once, and that due to the chiasitic arrangement. As in Otfrid, examples of inversion are numerous, probably owing to the livelier emotions of poetry, which demand for their expression the 'pathetic order.'

OHG., then, does not afford us much direct evidence as to the order of words in primitive Teutonic. We notice only that just as the phonology and inflections of OHG. have differentiated themselves from those of the cognate dialects, so the word-order has already adopted that peculiar differentiation, which, rigidly carried out, is characteristic of modern German.

#### IV.

##### OLD NORSE WORD-ORDER.

The subject of Old Norse word-order has, unfortunately, received but little attention. The only available treatment of the subject is that contained in Lund's *Oldnordisk Ord-føjningslære*, Kjøbenhavn, 1862, and this is very indefinite and unsatisfactory. Consequently, since the scope of the present work will not permit of a separate, detailed investigation in this dialect, the treatment in this chapter will necessarily be inadequate.

The materials for study are not entirely satisfactory. There are, first, the monuments of Old Icelandic and Old Norwegian literature, which, at the earliest, date back only to the end of the eleventh century, and which, therefore, cannot fairly be compared with the monuments in OHG., in Goth., and in OE.; second, the oldest Runic inscriptions, which are of too fragmentary a character to be of great value for the study of word-order.

##### I. Old Icelandic.

The earliest Icelandic literary monuments, as we said above, date back only to the end of the eleventh century; and the *Younger Edda*, which is the most available work for

our purpose, appears in a manuscript of about 1300 A.D. The results, then, of an investigation of word-order in these monuments cannot be taken as representative of primitive word-order in Old Norse. On the contrary, the aptness of the idiom and the directness of the style in the *Younger Edda* are such as characterize only languages in an advanced stage of development. We are interested, then, in the word-order of Old Icelandic only because it shows one of the different developments from the primitive Teutonic.

Lund affirms that the simplest order is: 1) subject (with its qualifiers); 2) predicate (with its qualifiers); 3) indirect object (*hensynet*); 4) direct object. There seems to be no fixed position for the other elements except that qualifications usually follow the main conception.

There are, however, nearly as many exceptions as there are instances falling under the rule.

1. The sentence often begins with a verb, not only when the verb is conceived as prominent, but in general in past narrative, and even in present, if the sentence is closely connected with the preceding and the subject is the same, so that the grammatical predicate has the greater weight.

2. The verb stands first in the apodosis, often with *þa* at the beginning.

3. If the sentence begins with an adverb or conjunction, or with a phrase, the verb precedes the subject.

4. In clauses of command, entreaty, and exclamation, the verb is placed first, also in interrogative clauses not beginning with a pronoun.

5. Phrases like "said he," etc., as in English, are inverted.

6. An interrogative clause begins with the interrogative particle, if it has one; a relative clause with the nearest word, even if this is governed by a preposition, which then preferably follows. Conjunctional subordinate clauses also usually begin with the conjunction. But each of these kinds of sentence may have a conjunction or connecting adverb first.

7. There are also certain exceptions for the sake of euphony. If a noun has two adjectives, one is put before

the verb, the other after. The auxiliary is often separated from the participle, the verb from the dependent infinitive.

There are also many instances of departure from the regular order for the sake of emphasis. A word which would otherwise follow, for the sake of emphasis is placed before. If by reason of contrast, or for any other reason, a word is the most important one for the meaning of the whole sentence, it is put at the beginning without regard to the kind of word or its regular position. This great freedom promotes a shorter, more vigorous mode of expression. Circumlocutions are avoided.

The attributive adjective usually precedes its noun. The genitive case dependent on a substantive usually follows, but may precede if one wishes to make prominent the idea contained in the dependent word. But in case of two adjectives, one may precede the noun, the other follow with *ok* (and). In case of two nouns, each with an adjective, the order is, *adjective, noun, noun, adjective*. When used with the definite article, the adjective may be placed either before or after the noun.

Prepositional adverbs modifying verbs, instead of being fused with the verb as in modern German, remain separate and follow the verb.

Another feature, so striking as to deserve special attention, is the separation of words for the sake of emphasis; *e.g.*:

*Harald's saga hins hárfagra*

Harold's sagas the fair-haired

*Hann hafði hjálm á höfði gullroðum . . .*

He had a helmet on his head, gold red and . . .

*Svá var hann kappsar . . . at . . .*

So was he impetuous . . . that . . .

Poetic order differs from prose order in greater freedom. Words are arranged not only with reference to meaning and to emphasis, but also with reference to rhythm. Furthermore, words belonging together may be separated. Even a word may be divided, and the parts separated; *e.g.*:

*Ha- reið á bak baru borð herti -kon vestan* (Hakon).

Lund's remarks, quoted above, in the main hold true. If, however, one look at the Younger Edda, he will notice some striking features not mentioned by Lund. Perhaps the most noticeable is the frequency of inversion; this is so frequent, both in principal and subordinate clauses, that it may be called the regular order. It is further a noticeable fact that there are no instances of long transposition. The order in principal and in subordinate clauses is the same, either inverted or 'normal.' Nearly the only instances of synthetic order in any form are due to the past participle or the dependent infinitive, which occasionally stand at the end of the clause, preceded by their dependencies. A striking illustration of the favored analytic order is afforded by the definite article, which regularly follows its noun.

In general, it may be said that the order of words in the Younger Edda is much like that in modern English, except for the frequent inversion, the occasional transposition of the infinitive or past participle to the end of the clause, and the irregular position of some particular word which for emphasis is put at the beginning or at the end of the clause. The order is remarkably free, and consequently the language is very flexible, more so than modern English. The important word is free to stand in the natural position of emphasis, and that, too, without unnatural inversion or awkward circumlocution.

## II. Old Runic Inscriptions.

More significant in its bearing on primitive Teutonic word-order is the evidence afforded by the old Runic inscriptions. Among these are included the oldest<sup>1</sup> monuments in any Teutonic dialect. Unfortunately they are very fragmentary.

Hermann makes the assertion that in the Runic inscriptions of Old Norse the order of words in principal clauses is *s. . . v.* 7(?) or 6 times, *s.v. . . .* 4 times; that two instances of subordinate clause are found, and that in both of these the verb is at the end. This assertion is somewhat sweeping. A more accurate notion may be formed by examining some

<sup>1</sup> Unless we consider the Finnic loan words.

of the principal inscriptions. These I shall arrange in the order of age, at the same time using Noreen's numbering.

Third century:

39. *owlþuþewaR in wane mariR* = Ollther in Vang (?) renowned.

Fourth century:

48. *talino ʒisaion wiliR . . . tipis hleuno* = . . . see will . . . (?)  
 13. *ek hlewaʒastiR holtinar horna tawiðo* = I, Hlegestr, (from) wood the horn made.  
 20. *ek erilar ansuʒisalas muha haiteʒa ʒaʒaʒinu ʒahelpu, sali jah haʒala wiʒju bi ʒ* = I, earl Asgisl, Moe am called, help, fortune, and prosperity consecrate . . .  
 8. *ðaʒar þar runo faihiðo* = Thagr these runes scratched.

Fifth century:

33. *iʒinon halaR* = Iginga's stone.

Sixth century:

19. *uþaR hite haraþanaR wit iah ek erilar runor waritu* = Over Hitr, Hrafu, we two, and I, earl, runes writ.  
 38. *þrawinan haitinaR was* = Thraenge's called was.  
 24. *ana hahaisla iniR frawaraðar* = over Haisl, Inr, Frarathr.  
 22. *ek erilar sa wilaʒar hateka . . .* = I, earl, who Wilagr am called.  
 6. *hrawðas hlaiwa* = Hrauth's grave.  
 25. . . ? . *swestar minu liubu meR waʒe* = sister mine dear (to) me, Wagr.  
 35. *haðulaikaR ek haʒustalðar hlaaiwiðo maʒu minino* = Hoth-laikr (lies here). I, Hoggstaldr, buried son mine.  
 42. *ek wiwaR after woðuriðe witaðahalaiðan worahto runor . . ? . .* = I, Yr, after Othri thr, wrought (the) runes . . ? . .  
 44. *ek haʒustalðar þewaR ʒoðaʒas* = I, Hoggstaldr, servant of Gothag.

Seventh century:

26. *iupinʒaR ik wakraR unnam wraitha* = Ythengr (rests here). I, Wacker, undertook the writing.  
 5. *eirilar hroRaR hroReR orte þat aRða . . .* = Earl Hror (of) Hror, made this . . .

Seventh–eighth century:

16. *afqr hariwulafa hapuwulafR haeruwulafR—warait runaR  
paiaR* = After Herewulf, Hathewulf (of) Holf cut runes  
these.
34. *niuha borumR niuhq zestumR hapuwolafR 3af hariwolafR  
maziu snuheka heðera zinoronoR . . ?* . = New (monu-  
ment) (to the) sons, new (to the) guests, Holfr gave,  
Herolfr (to the) son. Turn (I) here with runes.
3. *saR þat þarutR uti aR welaðauðe haeramalausR zinrunaR  
arazeu falahak haðera3 haiðRruno ronu* = He (who) this  
breaks, before (him) is baleful death. Harmless (I) big  
runes of witchcraft conceal here (of) honor runes sow.

I have quoted above, all the intelligible primitive Norse inscriptions that are long enough to be significant for word-order. It will at once be noted that there is a difference between inscriptions of different periods. In the six inscriptions of the third, fourth, and fifth centuries (39, 48, 13, 20, 8, 33) the order is, without exception, synthetic. The same is true of the first four (19, 38, 22, 6) of the sixth century. The last four (25, 35, 42, 44) of the sixth century have the analytic order. The two (26, 5) of the seventh and the first two (16, 34) of the eighth also have analytic order; and the last one of the eighth century has an arrangement of words quite like that characteristic of the classic Old Icelandic prose.

There is discernible, then, a gradual development from the synthetic to the analytic order. This is illustrated by the position of the demonstrative adjective. It occurs in but three of the above inscriptions. In the fourth century (8) and in the seventh (5) it precedes its noun; in the eighth century (16) it follows.

The verb stands at the end in each of the three subordinate clauses (22, 20, 3), though at least two of these are paratactic.

Inversion does not occur in the inscriptions until the eighth century, when it occurs (34, 3) as in Old Icelandic literature.

The evidence, then, of the old Runic inscriptions, though slender, is very valuable, because so early and because it



shows that the synthetic order was the earliest and that the order of words characteristic of literary Icelandic does not belong to primitive Teutonic, but is the result of a gradual special development.

## V.

### OLD SAXON WORD-ORDER.

For the facts of OS. word-order, we are indebted to Ries, who has made an exhaustive study of the word-order in the *Heliand*. From this work of Ries, a model in its kind, I have taken the most general statistics.

#### A. PRINCIPAL CLAUSES.

##### I. Affirmative Clauses.

##### 1. *Relative Position of Subject and Finite Verb.*

The fundamental type of word-order is the direct. The indirect (inverted) order is to be regarded, not as an exception to the rule, but as a means of expressing certain shades of meaning.

##### a. INDIRECT ORDER IN FREE USE.

##### 1. *From Logical Relation to the Context.*

Ries assumes that the first place in the sentence is the position of emphasis, and says that at times the verb bears the principal accent, and accordingly stands first.

##### 2. *Stylistic-Rhetorical-Syntactical Motives.*

For animation of style the chiasitic order may be used.

##### 3. *Rhythmical-Metrical Motives.*

The indirect order regularly occurs when some later member of the clause is placed first. Exceptions to this rule are to be explained mainly on rhythmical grounds.

Indirect order	{	with initial position of object	88
		“ “ adverbial expression	749
		“ “ predicate noun	6

Direct order	{	with initial position of object	11
		“ “ adverbial expression	96
		“ “ predicate noun	1

This use of indirect order may be known as 'regular-indirect' order, as distinguished from 'indirect order in free use,' when inversion occurs without introductory word. The use of direct order after an introductory word or phrase is known as 'irregular-direct,' as distinguished from 'regular-direct,' without such introduction. It is to be noticed that the 'regular-indirect' order is relatively more frequent with predicate nouns; the 'irregular-direct,' with object at the beginning.

The general statistics for inversion in principal-affirmative clauses are as follows:

In the first three thousand lines of the <i>Heliand</i>	{	Total	1023
		'Regular-direct'	330
		'Irregular-direct'	59
		'Indirect in free use'	188
		'Regular-indirect'	446

## 2. *Position of Verb with Relation to its Dependencies.*

For *Heliand* (1-3000) the statistics are as follows:

a. 'Regular-direct'	Total	330
	Neutral (only subj. and verb)	34
	Transposed ( <i>s. . . . v.</i> )	69
b. 'Irregular-direct'	Total	59
	Neutral	5
	Transposed	42

In about 32% of all clauses consisting of more than mere subject and verb, the order is transposed.

## II. Clauses of Command.

### 1. *Relative Position of Subject and Finite Verb.*

#### a. IMPERATIVE, WITH PRONOUN SUBJECT.

	INDIRECT.	DIRECT.
With introductory particle	20	7
Without introductory particle	32	3
Total	52	10

*b. SUBJUNCTIVE.*

	INDIRECT.	DIRECT.
With introductory particle	5	2
Without introductory particle	10	5
Total	15	7

*2. Position of Verb with Relation to its Dependencies.*

Of the 7 imperative clauses with 'irregular-direct' order, all are transposed (*s. . . v.*).

**III. Interrogative Clauses.***1. Relative Position of Subject and Finite Verb.*

	INDIRECT.	DIRECT.
With introductory word	39	11
Without introductory word	7	0

*2. Position of Verb with Relation to its Dependencies.*

Of the 8 interrogative clauses with 'irregular-direct' order, 7 are transposed (or partially transposed).

*B. SUBORDINATE CLAUSES.**1. Relative Position of Subject and Finite Verb.*

In principal clauses the indirect order, as we have seen, is nearly as frequent as the direct. In subordinate clauses the indirect order occurs but rarely, 158:1957 (7-8%).

Clauses with pronoun subjects, for metrical and logical reasons, employ the direct order exclusively.

In clauses with noun subjects, 158 out of 528 have indirect order.

	DIRECT.	INDIRECT.
With auxiliary verbs	105 (28 %)	104 (65 %)
Negative clauses	49 (13 %)	30 (19 %)
With negative-auxiliary verbs	20 (5 %)	27 (17 %)

When a later member of the clause is put first, as in principal clauses, the verb is attracted forward on account of a

feeling for the unity of the verb and the later members of the clause. It may be noted also, that, as in principal clauses, the attracting power is different with different words, the predicate word having the greatest, the object having the least; that is to say, the feeling for the unity of verb and predicate is stronger than for that of verb and object. In the instances of 'regular-indirect' order the word at the beginning was: object (14%), adverbial expression (40%), predicate noun (45%). In the instances of 'irregular-direct' order, the word at the beginning was: object (40%), adverbial expression (53%), predicate word (6%).

## 2. *Position of Verb with Relation to its Dependencies.*

For *Heliand* (1-3000) the statistics are as follows:

Total (subordinate clauses)	350
Neutral	33
Verb at end	145
Verb in middle position	78

In subordinate clauses consisting of more than mere subject and verb, the verb is separated from the subject in 70% of all instances, as against 32% in principal clauses.

## VI.

### OLD ENGLISH WORD-ORDER.

The subject of Old English word-order has already received some attention. The word-order of *Beowulf* has been examined by Ries and Todt, that of the *AS. Chronicle* by Kube, that of Alfred's *Orosius* and Ælfric's *Homilies* by Smith. I shall first summarize the results of these investigations, and then in succeeding chapters give more in detail the results of my study of the word-order in the AS. laws.

## A. BEOWULF.

From Ries's work I have derived the following table:

I. Independent Affirmative Clauses. (*Beowulf*, 1-1000.)

1. 'Regular-direct,' Total	152	
Neutral	33	
S. and V. separated	76	(Transp. 36, Part. Transp. 40)
2. 'Irregular-direct,' Total	91	
Neutral	9	
S. and V. separated	66	
Ind. Affirm. Clauses (direct order)	Total	243
	Neutral	42
		201
	S. and V. separated, Total	142 (70%)

II. Subordinate Clauses. (*Beowulf*, 1-500.)

Total	125
Neutral	23
Verb at end (transposed)	51 (50%)

NOTE. — In 67% of the instances in which the verb is not at the end, it occupies a medial position, so that in subordinate clauses the verb is separated from the subject in about 83% of all instances, as opposed to 70% in principal clauses.

The arbitrary system that Todt has adopted makes it difficult for us to utilize the results of his investigation in *Beowulf*. The verb, according to his scheme, may stand, *a*) at the beginning, *b*) after the first word, *c*) after several members, *d*) at the end. Todt renders this scheme still more complicated by making the following qualifications: When there is no object, the position *d*) is not conceivable, for whether or not an unimportant expression follows a verb already preceded by several independent members is unessential, the clause is to be classed as *c*). If, on the other hand, both subject and object precede the verb, the clause is classed *d*), no matter if a modifier follows. For purposes of comparison, the only way of utilizing Todt's results is by grouping classes *c*) and *d*) into one class in which are included all clauses with direct order which have words interposed between subject and predicate.

**I. Independent Affirmative Clauses.****1. Simple Verbs.**

a) 98	b) 204	c) 213	d) 355
-------	--------	--------	--------

**2. Auxiliary Verbs.**

a) 17	b) 45	c) 15	d) 4
-------	-------	-------	------

**3. The Copula.**

a) 81	b) 166	c) 29	d) 7
-------	--------	-------	------

**4. Modal Verbs.**

a) 31	b) 36	c) 54	d) 19
-------	-------	-------	-------

**5. Verbs with the Infinitive.**

a) 29	b) 30	c) 43	d) 8
-------	-------	-------	------

**TOTAL.**

a) 256	b) 481	c) 354	d) 393
--------	--------	--------	--------

From these statistics it is impossible to determine anything concerning the relative position of subject and finite verb. But the frequency with which the verb is separated from the subject is very noticeable. This separation (transposition or partial transposition) occurs in 50% of all clauses. The discrepancy between this percentage and that obtained by Ries is to be explained by the fact that while Ries excepts all 'neutral' clauses (only subject and predicate), Todt counts all such clauses as untransposed.

It is further to be noted that the simple verb is separated from the subject much more frequently than are the other verbs, auxiliary, etc.

**II. Subordinate Clauses****1. Simple Verb.**

b) 9	c) 297	d) 332
------	--------	--------

In the clauses with fully stressed subject the verb stands at the end 47 times, not at the end 27 times. The corresponding ratio in principal clauses is 86 : 73.

2. *Auxiliary Verbs.*

b) 2                      c) 14                      d) 8

The inclination to stand at the end is very strong, as is shown by the position of the participle, which precedes 18 times, follows 6 times. The corresponding ratio for principal clauses is 8:73.

3. *Copula.*

b) 8                      c) 43                      d) 47

4. *Modal Verb.*

b) 5                      c) 74                      d) 59

The infinitive precedes 92 times, follows 46 times. The corresponding ratio for principal clauses is 37:103.

## TOTAL.

b) 26                      c) 428                      d) 346

The verb is separated from the subject in 96% of all instances.

We notice, then, both in principal and in subordinate clauses a marked tendency to place the verb at the end, or at least after several of its dependencies. This tendency is stronger in subordinate than in principal clauses, and in the case of simple verbs than in that of auxiliaries, etc.

## B. AS. CHRONICLE.

The results of Kube's examination of word-order in the *Chronicle* are somewhat indefinite. In but few instances has he given any exact statistics.

His principal conclusions are as follows:

I. **Principal Clauses.**1. *Relative Position of Subject and Finite Verb.*

## a. DIRECT ORDER.

- |                          |                                   |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1) Interrogative clauses | Not at all.                       |
| 2) Imperative clauses    | Rarely.                           |
| 3) Affirmative clauses   | Under most diverse circumstances. |

## b. INDIRECT ORDER (INVERSION).

After introductory adverbs and adverbial phrases the order is:

Direct	220
Indirect	310

After *her* the order is:

Direct	175
Indirect	106

After *ha* the order in the apodosis is always indirect; in affirmative clauses:

Direct	6
Indirect	99

After adverbial expressions of time:

Direct	39
Indirect	81

In case of two clauses connected by *ond*, the first of which has indirect order, the order in the second is direct.

2. *Position of Verb with Relation to its Dependencies.*

A substantive in the accusative case usually follows the verb, but may precede. The personal pronoun in the accusative invariably precedes the verb. In case of indirect order, the arrangement may be either *v. s. o.* or *v. o. s.* In case of compound verbs, the object is usually one of the separating elements. Except in the case of pronouns, which sometimes precede the verb, the dative object comes third, whatever may be the relative position of subject and verb. The predicate noun follows the verb. Phrases of time and place not very frequently stand between subject and verb.

## II. Subordinate Clauses.

1. *Relative Clauses.*

The verb usually stands at the end except in the case of an object in the form of a clause. The second of two place-expressions sometimes follows the verb. Inversion is infrequent.



*2. Temporal Clauses.*

Verb usually last. Inversion only three times.

*3. Causal Clauses.*

Proportion of verbs at end, 1 : 1. Inversion only twice.

*4. Conditional Clauses.*

Only two instances. Both direct, transposed. The infinitive precedes the finite form.

*5. Concessive Clauses.*

Direct; transposed.

*6. Indirect Questions.*

Direct; verb stands at the end more often than within the clause.

*7. Object Clauses.*

Direct; usually transposed.

*8. Final Clauses.*

Direct; verb equally often at end and in medial position.

*9. Consecutive Clauses.*

Usually direct; verb more frequently in the medial position.

*10. Comparative Clauses.*

The few clauses that occur have direct order and the verb at the end.

**III. Position of Elements in Word-Groups.**

The genitive, subjective and objective, nearly always precedes.

The attributive adjective, with rare exceptions, precedes its substantive.

Numerals usually precede.

Possessives and indefinite pronouns (*eall*, *ilca*, etc.) precede.

C.<sup>1</sup> ALFRED'S OROSIUS AND ÆLFRIC'S HOMILIES.

## I. Independent Clauses.

The usual order is the 'normal.' In case of a compound verb, the auxiliary follows the subject immediately, medially, or finally. When modifiers are few, the final position is more usual. The pronoun in the dative regularly precedes the verb. There are only 9 exceptions in the *Orosius*. In a portion of the *Homilies* equal to the *Orosius*, 64 precede, 22 follow (3:1). The pronominal direct object also precedes. There are in *Orosius* 4 exceptions to this rule. In Ælfric, 88 precede, 20 follow. This preference of the pronoun for the initial position is due to the tendency to follow the antecedent as closely as possible.

Transposition also occurs occasionally in independent clauses. Smith gives us no statistics concerning the frequency.

When a word, phrase, or clause, other than the subject, or a co-ordinating conjunction begins the clause, the verb *may* be drawn forward and the subject made to follow.

There are two different aspects of inversion: 1) as a means of more closely uniting the inverted clause with the preceding (by *þa*, *þonne*, etc.); 2) as a means of indicating relative stress (*e.g.* when direct object begins). *Orosius* uses inversion for the first purpose more often, Ælfric more often for the second.

Inversion caused by an initial dependent clause is not frequent in OE., unless the apodosis is begun by a word like *þonne*.

## II. Dependent Clauses.

There are no instances in *Orosius* of inversion used to express condition, concession, or interrogation; only two of inversion to express command or persuasion. The *Homilies*, however, use inversion for all these purposes.

The order in dependent clauses is much varied.

<sup>1</sup> Smith, *Publ. Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, 1893.

I. *Orosius.*

## a. SIMPLE TENSES.

TOTAL.	NORMAL.	TRANSP.	PART. TRANSP.
328	46	259	23

## b. COMPOUND TENSES.

TOTAL.	NORMAL.	TRANSP.	PART. TRANSP.
188	47	111	28

NOTE.—Usually some form of the verb stands at the end. Either principal or auxiliary stands at the end in 162 instances.

2. *Homilies.*

## a. SIMPLE TENSES.

TOTAL.	NORMAL.	TRANSP.	PART. TRANSP.
314	139	155	20

## b. COMPOUND TENSES.

TOTAL.	NORMAL.	TRANSP.	PART. TRANSP.
186	69	53	64

NOTE.—Either principal or auxiliary verb stands at the end in 126 instances.

The order of words in *Oratio Obliqua* is more like that in independent clauses, than is the order in subordinate clauses.

I. *Orosius.*

## a. SIMPLE TENSES.

TOTAL.	NORMAL.	TRANSP.	PART. TRANSP.
46	23	21	2

## b. COMPOUND TENSES.

TOTAL.	NORMAL.	TRANSP.	PART. TRANSP.
44	28	10	6

NOTE.—Either principal or auxiliary verb stands at the end in 40 instances.

2. *Ælfric.*

## a. SIMPLE TENSES.

TOTAL.	NORMAL.	TRANSP.	PART. TRANSP.
50	30	13	7

## b. COMPOUND TENSES.

TOTAL.	NORMAL.	TRANSP.	PART. TRANSP.
46	15	9	22

The comparative study by Smith of the word-order in these two works seems, then, to show that the difference between principal and subordinate clauses was being levelled, that the normal order in modern English is the product of a gradual development, not, as asserted by Fiedler and Sachs, due to French influence. Further evidence will be brought to bear in the two following chapters.

## VII.

### WORD-ORDER IN ALFRED'S LAWS.

Old English word-order has been investigated in *Beowulf*, in the *Chronicle*, in Alfred's *Orosius*, and in Ælfric's *Homilies*. The results of these investigations, given in the preceding chapter, are most important; but there are not yet available a sufficient array of facts, for any absolutely satisfactory generalization. *Beowulf* does not truly represent OE. word-order, on account of the restraints of metre; the *Orosius* is open to suspicion, though slight, on the ground that it is a translation; Ælfric's *Homilies* represent the language at a later stage of its development; and the results of Kube's investigation of the *Chronicle* are unfortunately not in statistical form, and are hence not to any great extent available for our purpose.

For further investigation the Anglo-Saxon laws seem to be peculiarly fitted. They are evidently independent and are written in prose. They may, therefore, be taken as representative of the OE. speech feeling. They were also formulated at different times, some very early and continuing through the whole OE. period, and, therefore, afford an opportunity for study of the development of the language. As representatives of different periods, I have selected the code of Alfred and the code of Cnut. I have made a study of each, and have arranged the results in statistical form so as to exhibit the word-order current in each period, and by comparison to mark the lines of development.

## LAWS OF ALFRED.

## A. INDEPENDENT CLAUSES.

## I. Affirmative Clauses.

As explained in the introduction, in the matter of word-order, our subject for study is the relative position of the essential elements of a clause; the grammatical subject, grammatical predicate (finite verb), and grammatical object. The relative position of qualifier and qualified is included here, because such combinations of words are, at bottom, subordinate clauses; the qualifier being the predicate, the thing qualified being the subject. The relative position of the various co-ordinate dependencies is usually arbitrary, and is determined by the consideration of emphasis or of connection.

1. *Relative Position of Subject and Finite Verb.*

In Alfred's laws there occur 154 independent affirmative clauses.

TOTAL.	DIRECT.	INDIRECT (INVERTED).
154	119	35

NOTE. — The direct order is that in which the subject precedes the verb; the indirect (inverted), that in which the object precedes the subject.

Under 'direct' are included clauses in which the subject is not expressed. Under 'indirect' are included only the instances in which the subject (expressed) is preceded by the verb. Consequently the relative number of instances of inversion is not as small as might at first sight appear.

Inversion does not seem to follow any invariable rules, except that after the introductory particles, *ðonne*, *ða*, *ðær*, the order is always inverted. The High German rule according to which a later member of the clause (object or adverb), when standing at the beginning, attracts the verb forward, thus causing inversion, does not hold good in OE.

To be sure, of the thirty-five inverted clauses that occur, twenty-three have an introductory word. But it will be

noticed that this is merely a formal sign, and instead of being the cause of inversion, is perhaps the result.

The introductory words occurring are: (*þonne* 16 times), *þa* (3), *þeo* (1), *nu* (1), *eac* (1), *ðær* (1); *e.g.*:

*þonne sceal he be*, .LX. *hida* . . .,<sup>1</sup> 124, 2; *þa sendon hie ærend-  
zewrit to him*, 78, 26; *ða ƿesomnodon we us ymb ðæt*, 80, 7; *þeo  
wæs ƿoldðeoƿe* . . . *maran ðonne oðru*, 88, 15; *Nu sint ealƿelic*  
. . ., 88, 16; *eac is cieƿe monnum ƿereht*, 96, 11.

That inversion requires a particle as formal sign, is seemingly proved by the fact that inversion occurs without such sign only in negative clauses in which the negative particle stands first (12 times), *e.g.*:

*Nelle ic from minum hlaforde* . . ., 70, 4; *ne bið he ealles swa  
scyldið*, 72, 5; *ne bið se að na ðy mara*, 124, 5; *ne mot hine  
mon tieman* . . ., 124, 8.

That is to say, the verb never stands directly at the beginning.

When, however, the object or a prepositional phrase, or an adverbial expression more definite than *ðonne*, etc., stands first, the order is, without exception, direct; twenty-seven instances of such 'irregular-direct' order occur. In these clauses the introductory word or phrase is: the object (12 times), a prepositional phrase (9), *eac* (3), *swa* (1), *ærest* (1), .X., *wintra* (1); *e.g.*:

*7 eadmodnesse he lærde*, 78, 20; *mid him we sendon iudam* . . ., 80, 11; *Of ðissum anum dome mon mæg ƿeðencean* . . ., 80, 19; *Eac we settað* . . ., 86, 1; *þæt he mot*, 92, 8; *Ærest we bebeodað þætte* . . ., 110, 5; .X., *wintra cniht mæƿ bion ðiefðe ƿewita* 112, 13.

It must be noted that in many instances the subject is not formally expressed, so that there is no distinction between direct and inverted order. For the clauses in which the subject is formally expressed, and which are begun by some word or phrase other than the subject, the statistics are:

INVERTED.	DIRECT.
23 (such words as <i>ðonne</i> , etc.)	27 (objects, prep. phrases, etc.)

<sup>1</sup> The references are to page and line in "The Legal Code of Alfred the Great." Ed. by M. H. Turk, Halle, 1893.

Manifestly, then, the HG. rule is not valid in OE.

The occurrence of inversion in independent clauses is confined almost exclusively to the apodosis, perhaps owing to the fact that in the laws most of the principal clauses are in the apodosis. Out of 35 instances of inversion 29 are in the apodosis, *e.g.* :

*3if he ne wille his wæpenu sellan, þonne mot he feohtan on hine*, 102, 7; *3if he hit ðonne dierneð, ðonne rymeð he ðam deadan . . .*, 116, 2; *ne þearf he hiora mǣ 3eldan, wære hiora swa fela swa hiora wære*, 122, 17.

But clauses in the apodosis are by no means always inverted. As against the 29 instances of inversion in the apodosis, there are 24 instances of direct order; *e.g.* :

*3if 3e þonne elles doð, hie cleopiað to me 7 ic 3ehiere hie 7 ic eow þonne slea mid minum sweorde, 7 ic 3edð þret . . .*, 76, 11; *3if he hine triewan wille . . .*, þæt be mot, 92, 7; *Gif feorcund mon oððe fremde buton we 3e 3eond wudu 3on 3e . . .*, for þeof he bið to profianne . . ., 114, 19.

To sum up, then, inversion occurs :

IN APODOSIS.		NOT IN APODOSIS.	
With Formal Introd.	Without Introd.	With Introd.	Without Introd.
19	10 (all neg.)	4	2 (both neg.)

The direct order occurs :

IN APODOSIS.	WITH OBJECT OR ADVERB FIRST IN CLAUSE.
24	27

## 2. *Position of the Verb with Relation to its Dependencies.*

In independent affirmative clauses the position of the verb with relation to its modifiers is in the main the same as in modern English. This order we will call the 'normal,' defining normal order more exactly as the order in which the finite verb follows immediately the grammatical subject. But this order, though general, is not universal. If we call 'transposed' those clauses in which the finite verb stands at the end after all its dependencies, and 'partially transposed' (Part.

Transp.) those clauses in which the finite verb 'has a medial position after part of its dependencies, and 'neutral' those clauses consisting of verb alone, or of subject and verb alone, then the statistics for independent affirmative clauses are :

TOTAL.	NORMAL.	TRANSP.	PART. TRANSP.	NEUTRAL.	INVERTED.
154	84	17	15	3	35

Examples of clauses with normal order need hardly be cited, *e.g.* :

*Ic ƿom dryhten ƿin 3od.*, 68, 2 ;  *þis syndan ƿa domas þe se ƿlmih-te3a . . .*, 78, 14 ;  *ƿlc mon mot onsacan frymðe 7 . . .*, 124, 6.

Examples of transposed clauses are :

*7 þus cƿæð*, 68, 2 ;  *7 ic hine 3ehiere*, 76, 20 ;  *Ic ƿa ƿlfred westseaxna cýning eallum minum witum þas 3eoowde*, 82, 20.

Examples of partially transposed (Part. Transp.) clauses are :

*7 on mone3a senoð bec hie writan hwær anne dom hwær oðerne*, 82, 7 ;  *7 on oðrum wisan bebead to healdanne*, 82, 12.

Examples of neutral clauses are :

*7 hie þa cƿædon þæt . . .*, 82, 21 ;  *Eac we bebeodað*, 100, 19.

It will at once be seen that the normal order predominates. Many of the clauses classed as transposed or partially transposed have an order that would be quite possible in modern English. As in modern English, an object or adverbial modifier may, for rhetorical purpose, be placed first. Such clauses ('irregular-direct'), whether the subject is expressed or not, are here classed as transposed or as partially transposed, according as the verb stands at the end or not.

The pronoun-object does not occur frequently enough to materially affect the result, but the pronoun-object precedes the verb relatively more often than other dependencies do.

#### PRONOUN-OBJECT.

ALONE BEFORE VERB.	BEFORE VERB, NOT ALONE.	AFTER VERB.
4	4	12 (Inv. 8)



*E.g.:*

7 *ic hine 3ehiere*, 76, 20; 7 *we 3ow cy3a3*. 7 *3a eldran bro3or h3elo 3ow wysca3*, 80, 2; *ne mot hine mon tieman to 3eowum men*, 124, 8; *3onne betyh3 hine mon eft o3re si3e*, 128, 24.

#### PARTICIPLE.

The past participle as part of a compound verb occurs only 17 times in principal clauses (including clauses of command). It stands at the end of the clause 13 times, the other 4 times following the finite verb directly, or separated only by the subject, *e.g.*:

*sie he mid stanum ofwor3od*, 72, 17; *ne sie his fl3esc eten*, 72, 17; *Eallum frium monnum 3as da3as sien for3ifene . . .*, 102, 22.

The present participle occurs only twice. In these two instances it follows the finite verb immediately.

*Dryhten w3as specende 3as word to Moyse*, 68, 1; 7 *3ac micelre 3esomnunge 3odes 3eowa w3as smea3ende be 3ære h3elo urra sawla*, 108, 30.

#### INFINITIVE.

The infinitive occurs 50 times in principal clauses. It stands at the end of the clause 28 times; followed only by finite verb *once*. It follows the finite verb directly 27 times, *e.g.*:

*Na3e he hie 3t on el3eodi3 folc to bebyc33anne*, 70, 10; *se sceal dea3e sweltan*, 70, 25; *.X. wintra cniht m3e3 bion 3ief3e 3ewita*, 112, 13; *Mon sceal simle to here3afole a3ifan 3et anum wyrhtan*, .VI., *w3e3a*, 128, 11.

## II. Clauses of Command.

The regular position of the verb is first in the clause (introductory particles being left out of consideration). When the subject is expressed, the order is regularly inverted. All exceptions may be explained on some special ground, rhetorical or other.

NOTE. — It is so often impossible to distinguish between optative and imperative that no discrimination has been made in the treatment. But from observations made, I feel justified in saying that the order is the same in the two kinds of clause.

Narrowing our attention to inversion, we obtain the following results:

IN APODOSIS (105).		NOT IN APODOSIS (38).	
With Introd.	Without Introd.	With Introd.	Without Introd.
12	95 (7 neg.)	18	18 (12 neg.)

*e.g.:*

*Ʒif hwa ƷebycƷƷe cristene þeow, .VI. Ʒear ðeowƷe he, ðy siofoðan beo he frioh ðrceapunƷa, 68, 19, 20; Mid swelce hræƷle he ineode, mid swelce ƷanƷe he út, 70, 1; Ne minne noman ne ciƷ ðu on idelnesse, 68, 5; Utancumene 7 elðeodiƷe ne Ʒeswenc ðu no, 76, 8; Dem ðu swiðe emne, 78, 3.*

Those clauses of command in which the order is not inverted, and in which the verb does not stand first, demand special consideration. Such exceptions to the rule are usually due to the desire to emphasize some word or phrase, which accordingly is given the initial position, *e.g.:*

*ærcebisces þorƷes bryce oððe his mund byrd Ʒebete mid ðrim pundum, 84, 20; Gif hund mon toslite oððe abite, æt forman misdæde Ʒeselle .VI. scill, 92, 23; Ʒif syxhundum þissa hwæðer Ʒelimpe, ðriefealdlice arise be ðære cleriscan bote, 100, 1.*

Another consideration, which perhaps more often than the consideration of emphasis determines what shall stand first in the clause, is that of connection. There is a tendency to place first the word or phrase which links with the idea expressed in the preceding sentence, *e.g.:*

*wyrceað eow .VI. daƷas 7 on þam siofoðan restað eow, 68, 8; Ʒif hie sien bu Ʒelic, ord 7 hindeweard sceaft, þæt sie butan pleo, 98, 7.*

The instances of transposition and partial transposition, and also of normal order, occur most frequently in a last clause of a series. In some instances this is due to one of the motives mentioned above; in others it seems to be for rhetorical effect — *chiasmus*, *e.g.:*

*Ʒif ðeowmon wyrce on sunnandæƷ be his hlafordes hæse, sie he frioh 7 se hlaford Ʒeselle .XXX. scill. to wite, 110, 11; Ʒif he medren mæƷas naƷe, Ʒielden þa ƷeƷildan healfne, for healfne he*

*fleo*, 94, 24; *3if hire bearn mon ofslea*, *3ielde cynin3e para medren mæ3a dêl*, *fædren mæ3um hiora dæl mon a3ife*, 88, 7.

For clauses of command, the general statistics are :

SUBJECT EXPRESSED (183).				SUBJECT NOT EXPRESSED (203).		
Inv.	Normal.	Part. Transp.	Transp.	First.	Not First.	Neutr.
143	16	7	17	158	43	2

## B. SUBORDINATE CLAUSES.

### 1. Relative Position of Subject and Finite Verb.

In subordinate clauses the finite verb regularly follows the subject. Inversion occurs only in isolated instances. In 429 conditional clauses there are only 9 instances of inversion : 8 times in clauses with *3if*, once where the inversion serves to indicate the conditional nature of the clause, *e.g.* :

*Gif in feaxe bið wund*, 104, 4; *wære hiora swa fela swa hiora wære*, 122, 18.

There is one inverted relative clause, . . . *þæt mæ3e .XXX. swina understandan*, 122, 20; one substantive clause (really an instance of parataxis), *ðara 3ehwelc we willað, sy twy bote* . . ., 86, 18; one temporal clause, *ðonne hæfð he þæt wite afylled mid þy aðe* . . ., 126, 9; one purpose clause, *þæt hine moton his mæ3as unsyn3ian*, 116, 3.

### 2. Position of the Verb with Relation to its Dependencies.

#### a. RELATIVE CLAUSES.

	TOTAL.	NORMAL.	TRANSP.	PART. TRANSP.	INVERTED.	NEUTRAL.
<i>e.g.</i> :	158	20	103	17	1	18

*se ðe stalað on sunnan niht oððe on 3ehhol*, 86, 16; *se ðæs wæpnes onlah*, 92, 6; *þe ærest fulluhte onfen3 on an3elcynne*, 82, 18.

With relative clauses are included clauses of manner introduced by *swa*, *e.g.* :

*swa he ðer sceolde*, 84, 4.

## b. SUBSTANTIVE CLAUSES.

	TOTAL.	NORMAL.	TRANSP.	PART. TRANSP.	INVERTED.	NEUTRAL.
<i>e.g.:</i>	82	18	50	12	1	3
<i>Ʒemyne þæt ðu ƷehalƷiƷe þone ræste dæƷ, 68, 7; þæt he æƷhwelcne onryht Ʒedemeð, 80, 20; þæt he him nan oðer ne sealde buton þæt ilce, 132, 24.</i>						

## c. CLAUSES OF COMPARISON.

	TOTAL.	NORMAL.	TRANSP.	PART. TRANSP.	INVERTED.	NEUTRAL.
<i>e.g.:</i>	4	0	2	1	0	1
<i>. . . ðonne hie mon be þam were ƷeahtiƷe, 96, 6; þonne him mon aceorfe þa tunƷon of, 96, 4.</i>						

## d. TEMPORAL CLAUSES.

	TOTAL.	NORMAL.	TRANSP.	PART. TRANSP.	INVERTED.	NEUTRAL.
<i>e.g.:</i>	29	6	16	4	1	2
<i>siððan se áncenneda dryhtnes sunu . . . on middanƷeard cwom, 78, 15; oð ðæt anƷylde arise to .XXX. scill., 88, 13; 7 þonne him ðearf sie ma manna up mid him to habbanne on hiora fore, 96, 15.</i>						

Under this head are included quite different kinds of clauses, introduced by the conjunctions *þonne*, *siððan*, and *oð*.

## e. PURPOSE CLAUSES.

	TOTAL.	NORMAL.	TRANSP.	PART. TRANSP.	INVERTED.	NEUTRAL.
<i>e.g.:</i>	9	2	4	2	1	0
<i>þæt ðu sie þy lenƷ libbende on eorþan, 68, 13; þæt he mon mid ofslea, 92, 3; þætte næniƷ ealdormonna . . . æfter þam wære awendende ðas ure domas, 110, 2.</i>						

## f. INDIRECT QUESTION.

	TOTAL.	NORMAL.	TRANSP.	PART. TRANSP.	INVERTED.	NEUTRAL.
<i>e.g.:</i>	5	0	5	0	0	0
<i>hwæt þæs ðam lician wolde . . ., 82, 15.</i>						

## g. CONDITIONAL CLAUSES.

	TOTAL.	NORMAL.	TRANSP.	PART. TRANSP.	INVERTED.	NEUTRAL.
	429	112	228	53	9	27

Of the 9 instances of inversion, 4 are included under other heads (130, 1; 106, 24; 104, 4; 78, 2), *e.g.* :

*Gif hit ðonne bið wilisc onstal*, 124, 5; *Ȝif hio dead sie*, 72, 9; *Gif mon forstolene man befo æt oðrum*, 126, 4.

#### h. RESULT CLAUSES.

	TOTAL.	NORMAL.	TRANSP.	PART. TRANSP.	INVERTED.	NEUTRAL.
<i>e.g.</i> :	12	8	3	0	0	1

*þæt hie beoð forode*, 104, 18; *þæt hie dead sien*, 72, 16.

#### i. CAUSAL CLAUSES.

	TOTAL.	NORMAL.	TRANSP.	PART. TRANSP.	INVERTED.	NEUTRAL.
<i>e.g.</i> :	16	9	3	4	0	0

*forþon þe hit was his aȝen fioh*, 72, 6; *forþam ðe ȝod ælmihtiȝ þam nane ne ȝedemde*, 82, 3; *forþam on .VI. daȝum crist ȝeworhte hiofonas 7 eorðan . . .*, 68, 9.

#### j. CONCESSIVE CLAUSES.

	TOTAL.	NORMAL.	TRANSP.	PART. TRANSP.	INVERTED.	NEUTRAL.
<i>e.g.</i> :	6	4	1	1	0	0

*Deah hwa ȝebycȝe his dohtor on þeowenne*, 70, 8; *ðeah he scyldiȝ sie*, 112, 25; *þeah hine mon befð ymb niht*, 132, 5.

#### *Position of the Pronoun-Object in Subordinate Clauses.*

The pronoun-object occurs with such great frequency in subordinate clauses that it must be taken into special account in the consideration of word-order. In principal clauses the pronoun-object occurs only in 20 instances, and is not of much importance in the consideration of word-order. In subordinate clauses it occurs in 183 instances, and, since it nearly always precedes the verb, accounts in part for the frequency of transposition in subordinate clauses. Perhaps the feeling that the transposed order is the natural one for the subordinate clause is in part due to the frequent occurrence of the pronoun before the verb. In the following statistics, the 91 instances in which the pronoun-object stands

alone before the verb are to be classed as transposed or partially transposed, and this transposition is due in these instances entirely to the position of the pronoun.

## PRONOUN.

ALONE BEFORE VERB.	BEFORE VERB, NOT ALONE.	AFTER VERB.
91	88	4

## SUBORDINATE CLAUSES. SUMMARY.

TOTAL.	NORMAL.	TRANSP.	PART. TRANSP.	INVERTED.	NEUTRAL.
752	179	415	95	13	52

## PARTICIPLE.

The past participle as part of a compound verb occurs 64 times in subordinate clauses. Here, as in principal clauses, there is manifest a tendency to place the participle at the end of the clause. It stands at the end of the clause 39 times. It must be noted, however, that in 18 of these instances the clause consists only of subject, finite verb, and participle. The tendency to place the participle last is even stronger than that to put the finite verb last, for the order, . . . *v.* participle, occurs 21 times, as against . . . participle *v.*, 15 times. The exact statistics for the position of the participle are as follows :

<i>a.</i> . . . part.	18 (v. s. part. once)
<i>b.</i> . . . v. part.	21 (s. v. part. 19 times)
<i>c.</i> . . . part. v.	15 (s. part. v. 6 times)
<i>d.</i> part. . . . v.	0
<i>e.</i> v. part. . . .	5
<i>f.</i> part. v. . . .	1
<i>g.</i> . . . part. . . .	2
<i>h.</i> . . . part. v. . . .	1

The verb, it will be seen, directly precedes the participle 27 times. The participle directly precedes the verb 16 times. Examples of the different arrangements are :

- a.* 7 *he weorðe þær ofslegen*, 74, 12.
- b.* 6 *Gif mid him cwicum sie funden þæt*, . . . 74, 16.
- c.* 7 *hit onbestæled sie*.
- e.* 6 *Gif fyr sie ontended ryt to bærnanne*, 74, 19.

*f. ær þam þe his apostolas tofarene wæron, . . . 78, 21.*

*g. ðe wære to æwum wife forgifen his fæder, 102, 20.*

*h. se ðe oft betyzen wære ðief ðe, 120, 12.*

The present participle with finite verb occurs in subordinate clauses only twice:

*þætte næniȝ ealdormonna ne us underȝeðeodedra æfter þam wære  
awendende ðas ure domas, 110, 4; þe . . . ȝod self sprecende wæs  
to moyse, 78, 14.*

The past participle, then, seems to have a claim on last place even stronger than that of the finite verb.

#### INFINITIVE.

The infinitive occurs 82 times in subordinate clauses. Its position is:

<i>a. . . . infin.</i>	26	<i>e. v. infin. . . .</i>	1
<i>b. . . . v. infin.</i>	11	<i>f. infin. v. . . .</i>	1
<i>c. . . . infin. v.</i>	39	<i>g. . . . infin. . . .</i>	4
<i>d. infin. . . . v.</i>	0		

It will be seen from the above table that the infinitive usually stands either last, or next to the last, followed by the finite verb. It may also be noted that the finite verb follows the infinitive (40:11) more often than the past participle does (16:27). The infinitive is evidently more dependent on the finite verb than the participle is.

Examples of the different arrangements are:

*a. Gif he ðonne alefe his suna mid to hæmianne, 70, 13.*

*b. 7 him bebed to healdanne, 78, 15.*

*c. þæt he hine bereccean ne mæȝe, 70, 26.*

*e. Da fæmnan þe ȝewuniað onfon ȝealdor cræftiȝan 7 . . . 76, 5.*

*f. 7 he þeah utȝonȝan mæȝe bi stafe, 72, 1.*

*g. 7 þonne him ðearf sie ma manna up mid him habanne on hiora fore, 96, 16.*

Similar to the tendency to place the participle and infinitive at the end of the clause is the tendency to place the predicate adjective after its dependencies, last in the clause. As in the

case of the infinitive and participle, this is only a tendency, by no means an invariable rule. Examples are :

*Ne sie he na mansleȝes scyldiȝ*, 74, 12 ; *oxan eaȝe bið* .V. *þæninȝa weorð*, 128, 10.

The favorite position above referred to, of the participle, infinitive, and predicate adjective, may be taken as an illustration of a more general tendency, — that to place the governing word after the word governed, or, otherwise expressed, to place the most important word last, thus producing what has been variously called ‘ascending construction’ and ‘synthetic order.’ As further illustration of this general tendency may be cited the following passages :

*þæt he sie æfre siððan þeow*, 70, 8 ; *7 he ne sie idæȝes deað*, 72, 4 ; *hæbbe hi siððan him to wife*, 76, 2 ; *his ðone nehstan*, 70, 28 ; *us underȝeðeodedra*, 110, 3 ; *eac we cweðað þæt mon mote mid his hlaforde feohtan orwiȝe*, 102, 12 ; *siððan hit to ðam arise þæt anȝylde*, 88, 14.

As further illustration of this same general tendency may be cited the usual position of the dependent genitive before its governing word. This position, though by no means the invariable one, occurs in a great majority of instances, *e.g.* :

*eȝipta londe*, 68, 3 ; *hiora ðeowdome*, 68, 3 ; *þines nehstan ierfes*, 68, 16 ; *butan ðæs muneces hlafordes lefnese*, 92, 14 ; *ðæs ȝewintredan monnes bot*, 94, 20 ; *ðas ure domas*, 110, 4 ; *ðæs deaðan mæȝas*, 120, 2.

A remarkable illustration of the freedom in the arrangement and of the peculiar value of the first and last places for emphasis is seen in the following passage :

*ðeofas we hatað oð* .VII. *men, from* .VII. *hloð to* .XXXV. *siððan bið here*, 114, 2, 3.

It is to be noted that there are no long transpositions, clause within clause, like those in modern German. The only instances of clause included within clause are subject clauses like the following :

*ȝielde se ðæs wæpnas onlah þæs weres ðriddan dæl*, 92, 5 ; *þonne sceal se ðe hine ah weorpan hine to honda hlaforde*, 132, 11, etc.



The object clause follows the verb upon which it depends, without exception, whether the governing clause be independent or subordinate.

In the later manuscripts of Alfred's laws are to be found many variations in order from that in the oldest manuscript, E, which we have followed. But the variations are so heterogeneous that it is difficult to make any generalization concerning them. If in the later manuscripts there seems to be no greater fondness for the synthetic order, on the other hand, it may be said with certainty that writers of later manuscripts show no greater fondness for the analytic order. There occur variations in both directions. The tendency, if any, seems to be toward greater regularity. In principal clauses of the later manuscripts the order is 'normal' more often than in Ms. E. On the other hand, in subordinate clauses the transposed order occurs in later manuscripts where Ms. E has the normal order. In commands, likewise, the changes in the later manuscripts are usually in the direction of greater regularity, *e.g.* :

- 78, 23 { *monega hæðena ðeoda hie to 3ode 3ecerdon.* E.  
           { *mone3a hæðena ðeoda hie 3ecerdon to gode.* H.  
 98, 8 { *Gif mon wille of bold 3etæl.* E., B.  
           { *Gif mon of bold 3etæle wille.* H.  
 100, 9 { *hit sie twybote.* E.  
           { *si hit twybote.* From margin of B.  
 104, 18 { *Gif monnes ceacan mon forslīhð.* E.  
           { *Gif man monnes ceacan forslea.* B.  
 112, 1 { *Gif hwa on ealdormonnes huse 3efeohto oððe on oðres*  
           { *3eðun3enes witan.* E., B.  
           { *Gif hwa on . . . huse oððe on . . . 3epun3enan 3efeohhte.* H.  
 124, 27 { *Gif 3esiðcund mon landa3ende forsitte fierd.* E.  
           { *Gif se siðcunde man landa3ende fyrde forsitte.* B.

In the laws of Alfred, then, the rule seems to be that the verb stands first in imperative clauses, second in principal-affirmative clauses, and last in subordinate clauses. Furthermore, there is manifest a tendency toward the synthetic order; that is, for governing word, whether finite verb, participle, infinitive, noun, or adjective, to follow the governed

word. This tendency is not manifest in every instance because of the operation of counter tendencies. In principal-affirmative clauses, for example, the favorite position of the verb is second. But even in such clauses, traces of the more general tendency are manifest in some instances; and we must assume that its operation originally was more general, and that in course of time, in special instances, for example in affirmative clauses, imperative clauses, etc., its influence was overcome by stronger special tendencies.

### VIII.

#### WORD-ORDER IN THE LAWS OF CNUT.

##### A. PRINCIPAL CLAUSES.

##### I. Affirmative Clauses.

##### 1. *Relative Position of Subject and Finite Verb.*

In Cnut's code there occur 115 principal clauses.

TOTAL.	DIRECT.	NEUTRAL.
115	88	27

NOTE. — In two clauses included under 'direct,' the subject is unexpressed.

It will be seen from the above statistics that the direct order predominates. If one studies the instances further, he will find that, as in Alfred's code, inversion follows no invariable rules. The tendencies seem to be the same in the two codes. Inversion occurs after an introductory word or phrase, 20 times, in clauses without such introduction, 7 times, so that evidently an introductory word or phrase is not a necessary condition for inversion. But that such an introduction favors inversion is shown by the greater relative frequency of inversion in clauses thus introduced. In the clauses with direct order the subject is preceded by words other than a conjunction only 18 times, about 20% of all instances. The inverted clauses have such introduction in 20 instances out of 27, more than 80% of all instances.

But, as in Alfred's code, it is to be noted that the introductory words are of different nature in the two kinds of clauses. In the inverted clauses the introductory words are as follows: *þonne* (1), predicate adjective and adverb (4), prepositional phrase (2), *eac* (1), *swa* (1), *nu* (1), *e.g.*:

*Donne is swiðe rihtlic þ . . .*, 2, 7;<sup>1</sup> *Micel is 7 mære þ sacerd ah to dónne*, 4, 4; *To ciric-bote sceal eall folc fylstan mid ryhte*, LXVI., 5; *7 eac ah hlaforða Ʒehwylc*, 20, 6; *swa sceal he . . .*, XXXVIII., 4; *Nu bidde ic Ʒeorne . . .*, LXXXV., 1.

In the clauses with 'irregular-direct' order the introductory words are: object direct or indirect (including dative of interest), 9; pred. noun or adjunct., 4; adverb, 5; prep. phrases, 2; *e.g.*:

*Eallum Cristenum mannum Ʒebyrað swiðe rihte*, 4, 1; *þ syndan biseopas 7 mæsse-preostas*, 26, 9; *7 swa hi dōð symle*, 4, 11; *And on Myrcean he ah . . .*, XIV., 1.

It will be seen from the above that the introductory words in inverted clauses are in a majority of instances words serving merely a formal purpose, *þonne*, *swa*, etc., pred. words and prep. phrases occurring only 6 times. Quite the reverse is true of clauses with 'irregular-direct' order in which, in 9 instances, the object stands first.

As in Alfred's code it is to be noted that, without exception, the inverted clauses without introductory words are negative. It is further to be noted that in Cnut's code there is but one instance of a negative clause with direct order.

It cannot with certainty be asserted that in the apodosis inversion is the rule. There are only 8 instances of inversion in the apodosis as against 19 instances in independent clauses. On the other hand, it is to be noted that in Cnut's code there is but one instance of direct order in the apodosis, and that in a relative apodosis.

<sup>1</sup> The references are to Cnut's Laws in Thorpe's *Ancient Laws of England*, Vol. I. Arabic numerals refer to the ecclesiastical division, Roman to secular division.

The general statistics, then, for inversion are :

APODOSIS.		INDEPENDENT CLAUSE.	
Introd.	Not Introd.	Introd.	Not introd.
7	1 (neg.)	13	6 (neg.)

## 2. *Position of the Verb with the Relation to its Dependencies.*

Here again the order of words in Cnut's code agrees in the main with that in Alfred's. Leaving out of consideration the inverted clauses, the statistics are as follows :

NOUN.	TRANSP.	PART. TRANSP.	NEUTRAL.
50	11	12	15

Instances of 'irregular-direct' order are classed as transposed or partially transposed, according as the verb stands at the end or not. But particles like, *þeah*, *þi*, etc., are not counted as producing this transposition.

Seven doubtful instances of *þæt is* . . ., are classed as normal.

Examples are :

*Dis is seo Ʒerædnys þe Cnut . . .* Introd. 1. 1 (Normal) ; *7 haliƷe enƷlas þærabutan hwearfianð 7 þa dæda bewearðiað 7 þurh Godes mihta þam sacerdan fylstað*, 4, 9, 10 (Transposed) ; *Eallum Cristenum mannum Ʒebyrað swiðe rihte . . .*, 4, 1 (Part. transp.) ; *And we lærað 7 biddað þ . . .*, 7, 1 (Neutral).

An examination of the passages cited above will show that with but few exceptions (8), in the clauses classed as transposed or part. transp., the order is the 'irregular-direct,' in which the subject immediately precedes the verb, but is itself preceded by some later member of the clause. The other instances are either crystallized phrases, *e.g.*: *And us ne þincð*, XXIV., 10; or are instances such as might occur in modern English, *e.g.*: *Husbryce 7 bæret 7 . . . æfter woruld-laƷe is botleas*, LXV., 2. That is to say, the normal order in principal clauses has become nearly as rigidly fixed as in modern English, or in any of the modern analytic languages.

The pronoun-object does not occur in principal clauses frequently enough to appreciably affect the above result. It may be noted, however, that the object pronoun precedes the verb relatively more frequently than the other dependencies do.

BEFORE VERB, ALONE.

3

BEFORE VERB, NOT ALONE.

0

AFTER VERB.

3

*þonne wurðe us eallum Godes miltse þe Ʒearuware*, 19, 8; *Ac ic hit forbeode heonon-forð*, LXXVII., 11; *And us ne þincð nan ryht þ . . .*, XXIV., 10; *he dereð him sylfum . . .*, XXXV., 6; *þonne sceal him cyninƷc beon*, XL., 2.

It is to be noted that the simple pronoun stands as near the beginning as it can without interfering with the general rules of order; also that the more natural position for it seems to be that after the verb.

## PARTICIPLES AND INFINITIVES.

The favorite position of the past participle in all principal clauses, including clauses of command, is at the end. In 10 out of 11 instances, the total number occurring, the participle occupies this position, *e.g.*:

*Ā si Godes nama ecelice Ʒebletsod*, 26, 14.

The only instance of other order is,

*þonne sƷ he āworpen of Ʒehādodra Ʒemanan*, 5, 25.

The present participle occurs only once; in that instance it has the position at the end.

*Donne móton þa hyrdas beon swiðe wacore 7 Ʒeornlice clƷƷiƷende*, 26, 8.

The favorite position of the infinitive also is at the end. It stands at the end in 21 out of 36 instances, *e.g.*:

*7 ne þearf æniƷ mynster-munuc ahwær mid rihte fæhð-bóte biddan*, 5, 21; *7 þi man sceal for Godes éƷe mæðe on háde Ʒecnáwan mid Ʒesceade*, 4, 14.

## PARTICIPLES.

TOTAL.	LAST.	NOT LAST.
12	11	1

## INFINITIVES.

TOTAL.	LAST.	NOT LAST.
36	21	15

## II. Clauses of Command.

1. *Relative Position of Subject and Finite Verb.*

As in Alfred's code, if we leave adverbs and particles out of consideration, the regular position of the verb is first in the clause; when the subject is expressed, the order is inverted.

SUBJECT EXPRESSED.		SUBJECT NOT EXPRESSED.		
Inverted.	Not Inverted.	First.	Not First.	Neutral.
133	40	110	13	4

*e.g.*: þonne siȝ þ bótleds, 2, 12; hæbbe he Godes miltse, 6, 11.

Of the 133 instances of inversion it is to be noted that a relatively greater number is without introductory word, and a relatively smaller number is in the apodosis, than in principal affirmative clauses.

TOTAL.	IN APODOSIS.		NOT IN APODOSIS.	
	With Introd.	Without Introd.	With Introd.	Without Introd.
<i>e.g.</i> : 134	20	60 (7 neg.)	15	39 (5 neg.)

*And ȝif æfre æniȝ mann heonan-forð Godes ciric-ȝrið swa abrecep . . . , þonne siȝ þæt bótleds, 2, 12; 7 ehte his ælc þara þe Godes freond siȝ, 2, 12; And ȝá ælc cyric-sceat into þam ealdan mynstre, 11, 5; And ealle Godes ȝerihtra fyrðriȝe man ȝeorne, 14, 1.*

Instances in which the order is other than 'First' (verb first, subj. unexpr.) or inverted may usually be explained on some special ground. The most frequent causes of order other than the regular are:

1) Chiasmus. The second, third, etc., clauses in a series frequently reverse the order of the first clause, apparently for euphony or for some other rhetorical effect, *e.g.*:

*þonne bête man þ ciric-ȝrið into þare cirican þe cynincȝes fullan nund-bryce 7 þa mynster-clensunȝe beȝite swa þarto ȝebyriȝe, 2, 18.*



It must be noted that, with one or two exceptions, all the commands are in the third person. In consequence the verb is nearly always subjunctive.

### III. Interrogative Clauses.

There is but one instance of direct question in Cnut's code ; in that one, as is to be expected, the order is inverted.

*Ac hu mæȝ þonne æfre æniȝ mann hine inweardlice tō Gode ȝebiddan,*  
22, 10.

#### B. SUBORDINATE CLAUSES.

##### 1. *Relative Position of Subject and Finite Verb.*

Inversion in subordinate clauses is rare. There are eighteen instances occurring in conditional clauses, but these consist of the repetition of one fixed formula, *sy hit*, or *sy he*, *e.g.* :

*sy hit þurh reafslác, sy hit þurh feohtlác . . .*, 3, 3, 4.

There is one instance in a substantive clause,

*þonne ȝefadiȝe man þa steore . . .*, II., 2.

four in causal clauses, *e.g.* :

*forþam þam byð witodlice God hold,* 20, 5.

and one in a relative clause,

*swa is deofol sylf,* 26, 6.

With the exception of the instances mentioned, all of which, it will be noted, occur either in conditional, in substantive, in relative, or in causal clauses, which partake largely of the nature of principal clauses, the order in subordinate clauses is invariably direct.

##### 2. *Position of the Finite Verb with Relation to its Dependencies.*

###### a. RELATIVE CLAUSES.

TOTAL.	NORMAL.	TRANSP.	PART. TRANSP.	INVERTED.	NEUTRAL.
219	20	129	23	1	46



With relative clauses are included *swa* clauses of manner and of comparison, also *þær* clauses of place, *e.g.* :

7 *wið þone weallendan brýne þe weallað on helle*, 6, 9 ; 7 *se þe þæs Ʒeswican wille*, 6, 11 ; *swa oft swa hi Ʒeornlice inweardre heortan clýpiað to criste*, 4, 11.

b. SUBSTANTIVE CLAUSES.

	TOTAL.	NORMAL.	TRANSP.	PART. TRANSP.	INVERTED.	NEUTRAL.
<i>e.g.</i> :	116	24	66	23	1	2

7 *sec Ʒe þ he wære dæd-bana opþe ræd-bana*, 5, 16 ; *And þ is þonne ærest, þ he his ð Ʒenne wær Criste 7 þam cynin Ʒce Ʒesylle 7 mid þam hine sylfne inla Ʒie to bôte*, 2, 15, 16.

c. CONDITIONAL CLAUSES.

	TOTAL.	NORMAL.	TRANSP.	PART. TRANSP.	INVERTED.	NEUTRAL.
<i>e.g.</i> :	213	10	135	22	18	28

*buton he ne mote beon nanes rihtes wyrðe innan his hundrede*, XVII., 2 ; *Ʒyf hine hwa afylle ofer .XII. wintre*, XX., 3 ; *Gif he æt þam þridan cyrre nan ryht næbbe*, XIX., 4 ; *Ʒif hit swa Ʒeweorðeð on En Ʒlala Ʒe*, XV., 15.

d. CONCESSIVE CLAUSES.

	TOTAL.	NORMAL.	TRANSP.	PART. TRANSP.	INVERTED.	NEUTRAL.
<i>e.g.</i> :	7	0	4	2	0	1

*þeah hit næfre metes ne abite*, LXXVII., 10 ; *þeah hwa his a Ʒen spere sette to oðres monnes huses dura 7 he þiðer-inn ærende hæbbe*, LXXVI., 1, 2.

e. RESULT CLAUSES.

	TOTAL.	NORMAL.	TRANSP.	PART. TRANSP.	INVERTED.	NEUTRAL.
<i>e.g.</i> :	8	3	3	2	0	0

*þ he huru cunne rihtne Ʒeledafan ðriht understandan*, 22, 2 ; *þ he binnon ciric-wá Ʒune mann-sla Ʒa weorðe*, 2, 11 ; *þ se cynin Ʒc him þurh þ feores Ʒeunne wið fulne bôte*, 2, 14.

f. INDIRECT QUESTIONS.

	TOTAL.	NORMAL.	TRANSP.	PART. TRANSP.	INVERTED.	NEUTRAL.
<i>e.g.</i> :	7	1 (?)	1	3	0	2

*swa hwæðer swa man mæ Ʒe swa cucne swa deadne*, XXV., 5 ; *hú he on manna sáulum mæst Ʒesceaðian mæ Ʒe*, 26, 7 ; *hu man fyrmost mæ Ʒe ræd arædian þeode to þearfe*, XI., 2.

## g. TEMPORAL CLAUSES.

TOTAL.	NORMAL.	TRANSP.	PART. TRANSP.	INVERTED.	NEUTRAL.
16	6	6	3	0	1

Under the head of temporal clauses are included several quite different kinds of clause, introduced respectively by the conjunctions; *þonne*, *syðþan*, *æfter*, *ær*, and *oð*. In all these clauses the tendency is toward transposition, but in no instance does more than a single one of the adverbial dependencies (usually a pronoun or an adverb) precede the verb, *e.g.*:

*þonne* *God demedeð manna ʒehwilcum be ærran ʒewyrhtan*, LXXXV., 7;  
*þonne he þus cweðe*, II., 5; *þonne us wære leðfre*, 18, 3.

## h. CAUSAL CLAUSES.

TOTAL.	NORMAL.	TRANSP.	PART. TRANSP.	INVERTED.	NEUTRAL.
<i>e.g.</i> : 15	5	3	3	4	0

*rpofam hi sceolan us lædan forð æt þam dome*, LXXXV., 6; *þe he for neode dyde þ þ he dyde*, LXIX., 13; *forþam eall þ we æfre for riht hlāford-helde dōð, eall we hit dōð us sylfum tō micelre þearfe*, 20, 4.

## i. PURPOSE CLAUSES.

TOTAL.	NORMAL.	TRANSP.	PART. TRANSP.	INVERTED.	NEUTRAL.
<i>e.g.</i> : 6	2	1	4	0	0

*þ he mote hentan æfter his aʒenan*, XIX., 7; *þ se wōd-frēca were-wulf tō swyðe ne slite*, 26, 12; *ne tō fela ne ābite of ʒodcundre heorde*, 26, 12.

## POSITION OF PRONOMINAL OBJECTS.

The pronominal object occurs in subordinate clauses much more frequently than in principal clauses. Consequently the pronoun-object becomes an important object of consideration in subordinate clauses. It occurs as follows:

TOTAL.	ALONE BEFORE VERB.	BEFORE VERB, NOT ALONE.	AFTER VERB.
115	54	52	9

It will be noted, then, that 54 of the instances of transposition and partial transposition in subordinate clauses are due entirely to the position of the pronoun, which, because it

refers back to the preceding sentence, always prefers a position at the beginning of the clause. Since the pronoun occurs with greater frequency in subordinate clauses, the greater frequency of transposition in subordinate clauses is in part to be attributed to the pronouns.

The position of the pronoun-object in the various kinds of clause is shown in the following tables.

CONDITIONAL.		
<i>a.</i> 16	<i>b.</i> 18	<i>c.</i> 2
CAUSAL.		
<i>a.</i> 2	<i>b.</i> 1	<i>c.</i> 2
RELATIVE.		
<i>a.</i> 15	<i>b.</i> 20	<i>c.</i> 1
SUBSTANTIVE.		
<i>a.</i> 6	<i>b.</i> 11	<i>c.</i> 3
CONCESSIVE.		
<i>a.</i> 0	<i>b.</i> 1	<i>c.</i> 0
TEMPORAL.		
<i>a.</i> 2	<i>b.</i> 0	<i>c.</i> 0
RESULT.		
<i>a.</i> 0	<i>b.</i> 1	<i>c.</i> 1
PURPOSE.		
<i>a.</i> 0	<i>b.</i> 1	<i>c.</i> 0
INDIRECT QUESTION.		
<i>a.</i> 3	<i>b.</i> 0	<i>c.</i> 0

NOTE. — *a.* = alone before verb ; *b.* = before verb, not alone ; *c.* = after verb.

SUBORDINATE CLAUSES.					
TOTAL.	NORMAL.	TRANSF.	PART. TRANSF.	INVERTED.	NEUTRAL.
607	71	347	85	24	80

## PARTICIPLE.

The statistics for the position of the past participle in subordinate clauses are as follows:

<i>a.</i> . . . part.	3
<i>b.</i> . . . v. part.	1
<i>c.</i> . . . part. v.	19
<i>d.</i> part. . . . v.	0
<i>e.</i> v. part. . . .	1
<i>f.</i> part. v. . . .	0
<i>g.</i> . . . part. . . .	0
<i>h.</i> . . . v. part. . . .	2
Total	26

A study of these figures reveals some interesting facts. In the first place, as in Alfred's code, there is a tendency to put the participle at the end of the clause. It stands either last or next to the last, followed only by the finite verb, in 23 instances out of a total of 26.

This tendency to place the participle last is counteracted by the tendency to throw the verb last in subordinate clauses. As a consequence, in 18 instances the participle precedes the finite verb (order *c*), whereas the finite verb precedes the final participle in only 4 instances, directly precedes (order *b*) only once. In principal clauses, where this tendency to transpose does not exist, the participle follows the finite verb in every instance.

Further, comparison with the corresponding figures for Alfred's code shows that the differentiation between principal and subordinate clauses has increased markedly in the period between Alfred and Cnut. In Alfred's code there is the same tendency to throw the participle to the end. In principal clauses the participle follows the finite verb in 18 instances out of 19. In subordinate clauses even the tendency to transpose is not strong enough to effectually oppose the tendency to put the participle at the end, so that in only 17 instances does the verb follow the participle as against the 48 instances in which the participle follows the verb. This shows that the claim of the finite verb on last place in sub-

ordinate clauses was not nearly so strong in Alfred's code as in Cnut's.

Examples of past participle in Cnut's code are :

- a. þ ælc freoman beo on hundrede 7 on teoðunze 7ebroht, XX., 2 ;*
- b. 3if wiccan oppe . . . akwar on lande wurðan agytene, IV., 4 ;*
- c. And 3if elles be cwicum mannum ciric3rið abrocen sý, 3, 1 ;*
- e. forþam wác bið se byrðe funden to beorde, 26, 3.*

#### INFINITIVE.

The infinitive occurs 83 times in subordinate clauses.

<i>a.</i>	. . . infin.	24
<i>b.</i>	. . . v. infin.	10
<i>c.</i>	. . . infin. v.	31
<i>d.</i>	infin. . . v.	0
<i>e.</i>	v. infin. . . .	3
<i>f.</i>	infin. v. . . .	2
<i>g.</i>	. . . infin. . . .	13

It will be noted that the tendency is to place the infinitive at the end of the clause. In subordinate clauses there exists also a counter tendency to place the finite verb last. Owing to this latter tendency the infinitive is obliged in many instances to stand next to the last (order *c*, 41 times). In this feature Cnut's code agrees almost exactly with that of Alfred. But the infinitive is not displaced by the finite verb nearly so uniformly as the past participle was. We must infer from this that the claim of the infinitive on the final position was much stronger than that of the past participle, *e.g.* :

- a. Ac hu mæ3 þonne æfre æni3 mann hine inweardlice to Gode 3ebiddan, 22, 11.*
- b. ænne God æfre woldan lifian 7 wurðian, 1, 2.*
- c. buton he on husle 3eladian wylle, 5, 15.*
- e. ac þonne we sceolan habban ðnweald leán . . . , 18, 5.*
- f. þ man freólsian sceal ofer eall En3lalond on .XV. kl. April., 17, 6.*
- g. 7 Cnut cin3c lifian mid rihtan 3etrywðan, 1, 3.*

#### IV. General Features.

This tendency to put the participle and infinitive at the end of the clause seems to be but one phase of a more general

tendency to put the governing word after the word governed. Further illustration of this synthetic order is supplied by predicate words, which, like the participle and the infinitive, both in subordinate and in principal clauses, seem to have a claim on last place in the clause, *e.g.* :

*Ne sind ealle cyricean na 3eltcre mæðe weoruldlice wurðscipes wyrðe*, 3, 6 ; *beo se wið þone cynin3c hundtwelfti3 scyldi3*, XV., 6 ; *And ne beo æni3 man æni3es teames wyrðe*, XXIII., 1 ; *uton beon á urum hlaforde holde 7 3etrieve*, 20, 2.

Still further illustration of the synthetic order is supplied by the relative position of noun and dependent genitive. With but few exceptions the governing noun follows the governed genitive. A striking instance is the phrase, *oðres mannes huses dura*, LXXV., 2.

Further instances of synthetic order are phrases like the following :

*sáwlum to hæle 7 us sylfum to þearfe*, 2, 2 ; *Gode to lófe 7 him sylfum to cynescipe*, Introd. 3, 4 ; *þam cynin3e to handa*, LXXVIII., 6.

Further note the position of the governing preposition.

*þe le3er-stop on si3*, 11, 3 ; *þe he þ fals mid worhte*, VIII., 6 ; *nime him fif 3estryne men to*, XXX., 31 ; *7 técan him to þam ni3oðan dæle*, 8, 9.

Interesting, because indicating the original order of words, are stereotyped forms of expression like *him þincð*.

It will be noted that in the two centuries between Alfred and Cnut there has been no breaking down of the old rules of word-order. On the contrary, the differentiation between principal and subordinate clauses is more marked in Cnut's code than in Alfred's. The tendency also to put the past participle at the end is more marked in Cnut's code.

It will be noted further that the sentence structure has become more complex. The relative clause frequently serves as subject of another clause, especially of clauses of command, *e.g.* :

*And seþe on 3emote mid wiðer-tihtlan hine sylfne oppe his man weri3e, hæbbe þ eall forwrecen*, XXVII., 2.

Such constructions occur, though rarely, in Alfred's code.

Further, there are numerous instances in which a whole clause is introduced parenthetically within another clause, *e.g.* :

*And 3elæste ælc wuduwe þa here 3eata binnan twelf-monðum buton hire ær to onha 3i 3e, witeleas, LXXIV., 12.*

Frequently a clause is interposed after the finite verb and before the dependent past participle, *e.g.* :

*þe nele þa heorde þe he healdan sceal mid hredme bewerian, 26, 4.*

In one instance a subordinate clause is interposed within a subordinate clause between the finite verb and the past participle.

*And 3if se bonda ær he dead wære beclypod wære, LXXIII., 3.*

In conclusion we must remark that the results of the investigation both in Cnut's code and in Alfred's are in a measure vitiated by the frequent recurrence of stereotyped phrases which must be counted, but which, as indicative of the speech feeling, cannot compare in value with independent forms of expression.

## IX.

### CONCLUSION.

From what has been said in the preceding pages, it may be seen that at the time of the earliest written monuments of the Teutonic group of languages, the dialectal differences were already well established. Each dialect differed from the others, not only in phonology and inflections, but also in word-order. In early Old English, in *Beowulf*, the differentiation between principal and subordinate clauses was not strongly marked, and in the later (prose) works is barely holding its own. In Old High German, on the other hand, even in the *Hildebrandslied*, principal clauses are distinguished from subordinate. In Old Norse a peculiar tendency to invert is discernible even in the primitive inscriptions of the eighth century, and is firmly established by the time of the Icelandic prose works of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

#### A. RELATIVE POSITION OF SUBJECT AND FINITE VERB.

The original order of words in affirmative clauses of primitive Teutonic seems to have been the *direct* as distinguished from the *inverted*. That the indirect (*inverted*) order was not the original, seems probable from the following considerations: 1) Questions and commands employ indirect order, while affirmative clauses employ most frequently the direct, and employ the indirect order only for the sake of the peculiar emphasis to be obtained by a departure from the rule. The difference in the nature of the clauses seems to have demanded a difference in the order of words. 2) With the possible exception of Celtic, all IE. languages in their oldest known form employ the direct order in affirmative clauses.

The phenomenon of inversion is difficult of explanation. The explanation is complicated in the first place by the circumstance that the accent of the first place in the clause varies with the context, so that it cannot be said with certainty that the first place in the clause is the position of emphasis. Again, clauses differ in nature. What is true of an affirmative clause does not hold true of an interrogative or an imperative clause. Again, the verb varies in importance. At one time it expresses the principal thought-element; at another time it accomplishes a purely formal function as auxiliary or as copula. Consequently, since the verb is at one time an important element, at another, unimportant, and since the initial place is at one time emphatic, at another time, unemphatic, obviously it is impossible to lay down any definite rule determining when inversion shall occur.

All that we can assert about inversion is that it is an order of words occurring side by side with the direct order in all the early Teutonic dialects. Except under certain circumstances, however, in affirmative clauses inversion is the exception rather than the rule. We must conclude that in all these early dialects, especially in the poetic monuments, the order is less rigidly fixed than in the corresponding modern lan-



guages. The old laws are breaking down, and new speech-feeling is developing. In many instances probably the word-order is determined by the nature of the clause, or by considerations of emphasis or of connection entirely independent of the restraints of a fixed arrangement of the syntactical elements.

When, after a later member of the clause in the initial position, the verb precedes the subject, the inversion is due to the principle of connection. The verb is closely connected in thought with the initial word or phrase, and is accordingly placed next to it. That such connection is the determining principle is proved by the statistics which Ries has gathered, showing that inversion is relatively more frequent after an initial predicate word than after an object. This is true because the verb is more closely connected in thought with the predicate word than with the object, and consequently is attracted to the former more frequently.

The consideration of emphasis causes the inversion in clauses of command. Such clauses are usually isolated, and consequently the first place is the position of emphasis. In commands the verbal element is the most important one. Hence the verb stands at the beginning. In questions answered by yes or no, the verb is usually not the principal element, but occupies the first place, which — owing to the ascending accentuation peculiar to the question — is not the position of emphasis. In the same way are to be explained clauses of wishing. In the enclitic expressions, such as 'said he,' '*quad er*,' which in all the old Teutonic dialects are inverted, the verbal element is the least important one, and therefore stands first, *i.e.* in the least emphatic position, next after the word bearing the principal stress. In like manner is to be explained the greater frequency of inversion in the case of negative verbs and of auxiliaries, and the less frequent occurrence in clauses with pronoun-object.

The origin of the use of inversion in the apodosis is the subject of dispute. Ries, supported by Ohly, believes that the inversion is explained by the nature of the clause, — that inversion is used to indicate *hypotaxis*. Starker, on the

other hand, asserts that the apodosis was originally paratactic, and that hypotaxis gradually developed from parataxis. In apodosis-clauses independent of the Latin, the proportion of paratactic clauses to hypotactic was: 1) in the OHG. Matthew translation, 8:0 (7:2?); 2) in Isidor, 13:4; 3) in Tatian, 26:25. Starker attributes the inversion to the anaphoric particle, which was more and more frequently inserted to indicate hypotaxis, and which, when not the subject of the clause, caused inversion on account of its initial position. Unfortunately we have not data enough at hand to decide the question.

We have not enough statistics to trace the development of inversion. But we can see that the development was different in the different dialects. In High German the rules for inversion were fixed even in Middle High German, except for apodosis clauses, and in Middle High German inversion has become under certain conditions the regular order. In the A.S. laws we may detect a slight decay of the feeling for inversion. In Cnut's code inversion occurs somewhat more frequently than in Alfred's code, but in the apodosis it is less frequent and the total number of instances is smaller. In English, inversion has become almost extinct. In Norse, on the other hand, it has become *almost the rule*.

#### B. POSITION OF THE VERB WITH RELATION TO ITS DEPENDENCIES.

From the statistics in the preceding chapter it may be seen that in all the Teutonic dialects the verb may be separated from the subject, not only in subordinate but in principal clauses. Further, in principal clauses we find the verb separated from the subject more frequently the farther back we go in time; for example, in *Beowulf*, in the Gothic Skeireins, and in the primitive Norse inscriptions. Further, in all the dialects there is manifest a fondness for the synthetic order. This is illustrated by the position of the genitive before its substantive and of the infinitive and participle after the words governed. Behaghel infers, from the evi-

dence of verbs with inseparable prefixes, that in primitive Teutonic the verb was at the end, and the evidence that we have cited above leads us to adopt his conclusion.

In this belief we are confirmed by the evidence afforded by the cognate IE. languages, in most of which the primitive position of the verb seems to have been at the end. This evidence of the cognate IE. languages also controverts Tomanetz's theory, that in primitive Teutonic the verb followed the subject immediately. For it is hardly probable that Teutonic had an order of words peculiar to itself. Wackernagel's hypothesis, that the differentiation in word-order between principal and subordinate clauses was original, is controverted by the same evidence. Further reason for disbelieving Wackernagel's hypothesis is the extreme probability (established by Hermann) that in primitive IE. there was no subordinate clause. It seems probable that hypotaxis is a development from parataxis.

It remains to establish motives which might have caused the gradual adoption of the analytic order. This is not a difficult matter. The gradual development of any language from its primitive form is attended by the tendency to crowd more and more into a single sentence, more and more to qualify the main assertion by the mention of accompanying details. The sentence, beginning as a very simple element in language, grows to a great complexity. With this increase in complexity, in many instances it becomes impossible for the primitive man, unskilled in handling complex sentences, to grasp at one time all the details. Accordingly, to the apparently finished sentence are added a number of explanatory details, afterthoughts; or some element, by reason of close connection with the following clause, may be put after the verb. To motives like these the analytic order probably owes its origin. Moreover, the verb, which in primitive language usually contained the new idea to be affirmed, and which, therefore, belonged at the end of the clause, in the course of development lost more and more of its original fulness of meaning. Verbal nouns and adjectives became the bearers of the principal thought, and the verb became

more and more colorless, in many instances becoming a mere formal auxiliary or copula. For example, note the evolution of the verb *have* in all languages, and especially in French. With this loss of fulness of meaning, the verb also lost its natural claim to its position of emphasis at the end of the clause. The sentence gradually took the form of a judgment, and the verb came to be regarded as a merely formal syntactical element used to connect the terms of this judgment.

This theory may be substantiated by facts cited by Ries from *Beowulf* and the *Heliand*. In *Beowulf*, in clauses with 'regular-direct' order, 63 to 64% of the verbs do not immediately follow the subject, as against 23 to 24% in the *Heliand*. In 'irregular-direct' order the proportion is about the same; the instances in which the verb does not immediately follow the subject are about  $4\frac{1}{2}$  times as frequent in *Beowulf*. The transposed order occurs in *Beowulf* in 50% of all subordinate clauses; 45 to 46% in the *Heliand*. In the case of the clauses not completely transposed, partial transposition occurs; in *Beowulf*, 67%; in the *Heliand*, 53 to 54%. That is to say, the movement of the verb from the end of the clause is farther advanced in the *Heliand* than in *Beowulf*.

But this progress is less in the case of subordinate clauses. Hence we infer that the differentiation between the two kinds of clause, which is little felt in *Beowulf*, is already established in the *Heliand*. There are many exceptions, but nevertheless a feeling that the difference in the nature of the clauses should be indicated by a difference in the structure. Further, the use of the transposed order in subordinate clauses was favored by the enclitic pronominal objects, which preceded the verb by preference, and which occurred more frequently in subordinate clauses. The year 800, according to Ries, marks approximately the time at which the differentiation was established. From the beginning of the ninth century the development of subordinate clauses is in the opposite direction toward transposition.

In Anglo-Saxon, Smith's statistics go to show that in the period between Alfred and Ælfric there had been some levelling of the difference between principal and subordi-

nate clauses, the order in both instances approaching toward the normal. A comparative study of the laws of Alfred and the laws of Cnut shows that in Cnut's code the difference was even more marked than in Alfred's. The cause of the development of the analytical order in subordinate clauses of modern English can be finally determined only by a study of Middle English prose with regard to French influence.

My general conclusions are as follows: In none of the existing early Teutonic languages does the order of words represent that of the primitive Teutonic. They have differentiated from the parent speech as much in word-order as in phonology. But from the evidence of the cognate IE. languages, from the general direction of the development within Teutonic, and from the tendencies common to all the early Teutonic languages; 1) the position of elements in compounds, especially the position of the inseparable prefix, 2) the frequent end-position of the verb even in principal clauses, more frequent the farther back we go, and 3) the fondness for synthetic order; — from all this evidence I conclude that in primitive Teutonic, in affirmative clauses, which were probably of the very simplest nature, the normal position of the verb was after its dependencies.

GEORGE H. MCKNIGHT.